MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW

1975

DA PAM 165-104

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW

INSIGHT

WINTER, 1975

PREFACE

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

The Military Chaplains' Review is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the Editor, Military Chaplains' Review, United States Army Chaplain Board, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland 20755. Articles should be approximately 8 to 18 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted.

"NOT TOO MANY YEARS AGO A COUPLE STOOD BEFORE YOUR ALTAR. THEY WERE YOUNG, NERVOUS AND FULL OF GREAT CONFIDENCE AS THEY PROFESSED THEIR UNDYING LOVE FOR EACH OTHER. THEY BECAME ONE IN THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY. AS PERSONS, THEY WERE SO DIFFERENT AND YET AS THEY PASSED BY, SO ALIKE BECAUSE OF THEIR UNITY AND LOVE. THROUGH THE YEARS THEY SHARED THIS LOVE

THROUGH COUNTLESS SMALL WAYS WITH EACH OTHER,
IN COUNTLESS PARTS OF THE WORLD,
WITH ALL THOSE WHO CAME WITHIN THEIR CIRCLE OF LOVE.

TO SAY ALL WAS PERFECT AND ALL BLISS IN THIS CIRCLE OF LOVE WOULD BE UNTRUE, FOR WE ARE TALKING ABOUT

THE WARMING RAYS OF LOVE
AND NOT THE PASSING CLOUDS OF ROMANCE
WHICH COME AND GO.

"THROUGH THE YEARS WAS A DEEP, SILENT AWARENESS THAT THE CIRCLE WOULD SOMEDAY BE BROKEN. I SAY SILENT BECAUSE IT IS VERY DIFFICULT FOR MANY OF US TO TALK ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF THE DEATH OF A LOVED ONE. IF WE HAD OUR WISH, HUMANLY SPEAKING, IT WOULD NEVER HAPPEN—BUT WE KNOW IT WILL, ALL TOO QUICKLY AND ALL TOO SOON.

THERE IS SO MUCH MORE THAT COULD HAVE BEEN SAID,
SO MUCH MORE THAT COULD HAVE BEEN SHARED—
AND THROUGH IT ALL THERE NEVER SEEMED TO BE ENOUGH TIME.

"AND YET GOD IN HIS INFINITE WISDOM DECIDED THAT THIS WAS THE TIME,

THIS WAS TO BE THE PLACE,
THIS WAS TO BE THE BEGINNING.

YES, THE BEGINNING, I DID NOT SAY END. YES, THE CIRCLE OF LOVE HAD TO BE BROKEN SO THAT IT COULD BECOME WIDER.

LIKE THE SEED THAT MUST DIE SO NEW
LIFE CAN GROW AND RISE UP—SO
THE SAME IS TRUE HERE.

IT IS HARD TO LET GO, BUT LET GO WE MUST IN ORDER FOR OUR LOVED ONE AND FOR ALL OF US TO RISE,

TO RISE NOT ONLY TO NEW LIFE
BUT ALSO TO NEW INSIGHTS, UNDERSTANDING,
AND AWARENESS OF OUR NEED FOR EACH OTHER—
AND ABOVE ALL OUR NEED FOR JESUS.

"THROUGHOUT THESE LAST DAYS, I AM SURE ALL OF YOU HAVE GONE THROUGH MUCH SOUL SEARCHING. IN QUESTIONING THE DEATH OF A LOVED ONE, WE QUESTION OURSELVES AND OUR OWN LIFESTYLE AND VALUES. WE RE-EXAMINE OUR OWN PRIORITIES AND THE MAIN THRUST OF OUR LIVES. WE REALIZE

THAT WE DO HAVE THE TIME,

WE MUST MAKE THE TIME,

WE MUST USE WELL THE PRECIOUS GIFT OF TIME BECAUSE IT GOES BY SO QUICKLY.

"AND SO WE HAVE THE TIME AND WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HEAL THE CIRCLE OF LIFE AND LOVE. TODAY WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO REACH OUT WITH OPEN ARMS AND ONCE MORE EMBRACE ALL THOSE WITHIN OUR CIRCLE OF LOVE."

CHAPLAIN (COL) JOHN D. BENSON

Homily delivered at funeral services
for GENERAL CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS
September 1974, Memorial Chapel,
Fort Myer, Virginia.

INSIGHT

Philosophers worthy of the name all entertained the ambition of giving an explanation of the world. Socrates, Aristotle, Descartes, Pascal, Hobbes, Bergson, James—the list is long—endeavored to give us consistent descriptions of our world. They have proven helpful by providing various designs with which we might construct our worldviews.

But today we have become more relational and introspective. We are concerned more with personal insight than with broad, philosophical explanations of existence. We are oriented more toward experiential knowledge which arises from the immediate context of our relationships with others than toward knowledge acquired from an arrangement of mental concepts. We find ourselves talking more about people, not propositions, about relationships, not rationales and abstract hypotheses. In all of our experiences we need and seek insight.

What is insight? Carroll Wise defined it as "the discovery of positive realities within the self or within the world external to the self by which one may live and grow with satisfactions and achievement." I view it as a process of recognition by which the meaning or significance of an object or situation becomes clear. It is always more than mere explanation. description, or presentation of content.

I am not convinced that one can teach another to gain insight. It appears to emerge from within whenever the kaleidoscopic pieces of life come together and form a pattern. But I am convinced that one can—as a catalyst—enable another to experience a moment of deep insight. In a variety of settings—a worship service, a sermon, a prayer, a hymn, an interview, a catechetical class—insight can and does come. It also comes to one in his daily work when a creative idea suddenly pops up. Such illuminations are invaluable and should be preserved as well as shared with others.

In effect, an insight is like a morning breeze which blows away the fog and allows one to see what's really there. To be specific, it gives one a sense of direction, a fresh perspective, and a basis for action. It enables one to sort out the pieces of experience and to rearrange them more meaningfully. Accompanying insight is the feeling that things fit. A quality of wholeness—mind, body, soul and spirit coalesce—floods the individual and fills him with

new strength and determination. The result is that one gains a better understanding of himself, his society, and his God.

When life has purpose and direction, it is focused. A photographer has to train his camera on a subject and adjust his lens so that the result will be sharp and unmistakable—in short, in focus. One without understanding is one whose focus on life is fuzzy and diffuse. His sense of purpose is unclear, hence, he displays conflicting attitudes.

You are, undoubtedly, familiar with the parable of the six blind men who tried to describe an elephant. Each, by touching a different part of the elephant's body, imagined the beast to be like a wall, a spear, a snake, a tree trunk, a fan, or a rope. Though each was partly right, they were all wrong. But should there have been someone else present to have the blind men exchange places and individually experience that portion of the elephant they had not felt previously, they ultimately would have described a more realistic elephant.

For many people, the everyday world is like that. Far too often we grasp a single piece of reality thinking that we have the whole of it. It is not until someone else comes along and allows us to see through his eyes that we gain insight. I believe that chaplains throughout the Army are doing just that—enabling others to develop insight into the meaning and mystery of life and into those values and relationships which affect the whole shape of their lives.

Those whose articles appear in this issue of the *Review* demonstrate their insight into particular crises and situations of life which concern us all. As professionals, they have shared with us a few insightful tools—based upon their research, first-hand experience, training, work, and background—which will assist us in ministering to the needs of the total community.

GERHARDT W. HYATT
Chaplain (Major General), USA
Chief of Chaplains

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Washington, DC, Winter 1975

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW

Articles Page

Managing Intangibles
The Honorable Herman R. Staudt 1

The Likable Chaplain
Chaplain (CPT) Thomas M. Warme 9

The Judeo-Christian Ethic and the New Humanism
Chaplain (MAJ) Robert S. Hess 13

The Black Experience in the Military Chapel
Chaplain (MAJ) John C. Pearson 23

The Army Racial Awareness Program at One Post
Chaplain (MAJ) Carl S. King 35

Mutual Protection Relationships in Anticipatory Grief
Chaplain (LTC) Danny W. Burttram 43

Book Reviews 57

MANAGING INTANGIBLES

The Honorable Herman R. Staudt
Under Secretary of the Army

At this particular moment we are going through a portion of the annual horrendous Pentagon planning cycle. We compare guidance from on high (not quite as high a level as chaplains are used to thinking of, but quite a bit above us) with our own reactions on earth, in the Army. Out of that comparison we develop what we call "Issue Papers" in areas where we'd like to suggest disagreement and hopefully lead to some modification of the requirements placed upon us.

As I've learned in recent months, the proper way to approach the definition of a requirement is to assess the threat. This is where it all starts. I would suggest that we here need to assess the threat, also, and to recognize the constantly changing scene regarding the unique product that you, as chaplains, are concerned with.

I don't think one can study our history and not perceive that wars and warfare are less and less a battle for material wealth or land or property than they used to be. After all, in World War II the winner got to rebuild the loser at the winner's expense. In North Vietnam, the offer to assist with rebuilding was an incentive to bring peace. In the Mid-East, we're offering both sides help if they will only be more cooperative. So the American motive for participation in war is not one of coveting something which someone else has, which we then—as an extension of our foreign policy—use our military forces to obtain. It's quite the opposite—quite the opposite.

Well, if war is less and less a battle for real estate or riches, looking at it from our peculiar American point of view, then what is it all about?

Let me suggest that as the emphasis on the real (or the real estate) point of view has been declining, warfare has increasingly become a battle for men's *minds*, their *souls*, and their *spirits*. That is really the battlefield. How did wars used to begin? We used to have an honorable system. On an individual basis, you slapped the man across the face, and then you agreed to meet to resolve your dispute under carefully controlled conditions.

Mr. Staudt delivered this address to open the annual Command Chaplains' Conference 16 July 1974, Washington, D.C.

Nations accomplished it by proclamation. That's all passé. Involvement can often begin in the most minute and insidious ways. In fact, the beginning is often not even observed or detected except by astute historians some years later, who came to realize that this or that incident was the beginning of this or that event, which event soon thereafter flared up into a war—except we don't call them wars anymore; they are "conflicts" or "police actions" or what have you. We often really don't know when they start. We're often not sure who's on which side while it's underway. And at times we can't even come to agreement on whether it's over, and, if so, when it stopped.

In the "olden days," as I understand them, when the conflict was over the combatants went home. Everyone knew who the winner was. Typically, the winner had more than when he started, because he took the other fellow's—whatever it was they fought over—went back home to nurse his wounds and was the number one man. But, he went home.

Some people think that still should be the case. There's some argument that we ought to leave Europe, for example. Well, I think if the total conflict were over, it would truly be the right thing to do. But you see, you get enmeshed in trying to establish what it is that has ended in Europe, and what it is that has begun in its place, and what we accomplish by staying or leaving. The simple rules of engagement of the past have all become rather blurry, so we cannot assess where we are by the concrete yardsticks of old. The statistics today are not measured in material or quantitative things. War has become a qualitative thing. The criterion for victory is far more obscure: where do you stand in men's minds, in men's souls, in men's spirits, not in terms of his real estate, or his riches.

We've had our famous missile gaps of the past and I think you'd agree that by everyone's definition the missile gap is narrowing. And, whereas the old philosophy was to achieve superiority so overwhelming that the other fellow wouldn't dare, today it is turned more toward parity and mutual strategic arms limitations. But, if the missile gap is narrowing, how about the gap in the mental, the psychological, and the spiritual condition of our forces? Let me suggest that if you take the typical American soldier and compare him with the typical soldier of those you would think of as our potential enemies, there is a gap—a significant gap—and I suggest that that gap probably exceeds both the missile gap and the technology gap, and at the moment is in our favor. But as the decades pass you cannot develop a relatively poor nation into a capability that can send men to the moon, and have them remain content with economic and spiritual

poverty on earth. That's impossible. So as our potential enemies raise their sights and expectations—both in the economic area and in the human area that you specialize in—as that hunger grows, it must be satisfied. The pressures to satisfy it are irresistible. And as that hunger is reduced, the gap between us and our potential enemies in that last frontier—where we have true superiority today—will become narrower . . . much narrower.

But in the meantime what can we do? Well, in typical Pentagon style, having assessed the threat, we must quickly get into the "bean-counting" world of what's available to meet the threat?

OUR RESOURCES

First of all, the "raw material" that we in Army management have to work with in today's Volunteer Army is not there by compulsion or fear. I think that's a tremendous psychological advantage over some counterparts elsewhere even though it has shortcomings—admitted shortcomings. This advantage is something to be worked with, to be built on, to be molded for good.

To build on this strength, we have to recognize the change in our human "raw material." Industry in the late nineteenth century learned that the industrial worker had higher expectations. Subsequently, working conditions began a radical change for the better. In much the same way, the soldier of 1974 expects more from Army management than he has ever expected before and we cannot get away without providing him what he expects. I am not speaking of housing, nor of commissary privileges. In fact, I'm not speaking of anything material. I'm speaking of leadership: man-to-man leadership; leadership that encourages a man to follow, not merely because of the insignia of rank worn on your shoulder, but because you are a man of strength, a man of height, of weight, a man of caliber. Leadership evokes the best in a man because he's proud to be in the outfit; he's proud to be a part of the Army team and he understands his reason for being there. The leader I speak of makes him willing to subordinate certain (but not all) of his personal freedoms for the common good of the group—and that voluntarily, not by fiat of authority or through fear of punishment.

I'm not suggesting that the Army has lived on authority and fear alone. Far from it. But I am suggesting that the emphasis on raw authority alone will have to be less in the future than perhaps it was in the past, if we are to continue to be successful.

The American in the 18 to 25 year category today will simply not accept what someone twenty years ago was able to sell more or less on authority alone. He won't accept it because he has other options available to him. He is not overwhelmed with the

lack of options or the insecurity that comes from a sense of being "locked-in." On the other hand, if such a person's questioning is met with a sound answer, one with an intelligent basis, his conviction, his motivation and his response under stress will far exceed that of the person who is driven in blindness or ignorance to merely obey "because I told you so." So the challenge for military management is far greater, far more demanding today than ever before in our lifetime. The challenge is greater, but so is the reward if we make the necessary investment in the most priceless resource we have in the Army—our men and women.

It's interesting to note that the penalties of not realizing the change in our "raw material" are equally high. If one has the makings of a good typical soldier and we do not realize his or her talent and potential, or if we misuse or abuse that talent, the ingenuity that could have been brought to bear to help us achieve our objective will instead be brought to bear to thwart and frustrate us—and that strength and genius will often truly astound and overwhelm us. The motivation and the strength of conviction that men have will typically be put to use in some direction; merely stamping out that potential force is not an alternative available to us. The choice we have is whether we channel this talent, ingenuity and effort in supporting our objectives, or whether we allow it to mature in opposition and debilitate our efforts to reach our objectives.

I've been talking about Army management and this certainly includes the typical squad leader, company commander or battalion commander. We normally think of these people as commanding, as being Army management. But there are many others who manage, as you well know, and they don't always get reflected on the "visible" organization chart. You here today are members of our management team, but you have a very, very special and unique role. There are very few of us on the Army management team who have the opportunity or the self-discipline to get off our "main track" even for a moment to look around and see what's going on and then get back onto our track having recalibrated our thinking and actions based on the fresh perspective gained during our momentary derailments. If one thinks of the Army as a world of superiors and subordinates, the superior finds it very difficult to stand off and look at himself and his relationships with his subordinates. He's typically fully occupied in living and breathing the role of being the boss. The subordinate is heavily enmeshed emotionally and intellectually with the pressures he feels. He, too, typically lacks the self-discipline to stand off to see whether what he feels is rational, or whether his prob-

lems start with himself or with his superior. By the book he's not even supposed to raise the question.

THE CHAPLAIN AND HUMAN RESOURCES

As chaplains you have an absolutely unique capability, and I believe responsibility, to enter both these worlds—the world of the superior and the subordinate. This is not a risk-free challenge. I recognize that. But what worth doing in life is truly risk-free? You have a choice. You can become a meaningless blip on the existence of time, or you can become an even more effective and vibrant force in meeting the Army's unique state-of-the-art human challenge which confronts us today. There is much virgin territory in this area in need of research, development, and progress in understanding what makes our people tick. How do we get better relations between superior and subordinate in a military environment based on a volunteer force? How do we get intelligent, questioning, young people to subordinate their individual desire to decide everything for themselves? We must find the answers, however imprecise or imperfect. We must find answers if we are to maintain an enlightened spiritual advantage over any authoritarian horde, no matter how brutal, how debasing, or how far back into the Dark Ages the relative spiritual strength of that challenging force may reach when it confronts our men. We have to insure that when future confrontations are over, the American soldier's score-card will continue to be one that both he and we can be proud of, and that we have won (whatever winning might mean for that particular encounter).

Today we have a volunteer Army established by administration policy. There have been some who have said that policy was and is a fundamental mistake. But I have yet to meet an expert in this field who thought it was a mistake, who could offer what he thought was a practicable, politically acceptable, salable alternative—bar none.

Since it was decided to go to a volunteer Army, Secretary Callaway has repeatedly gone on record as saying, "The challenge of a volunteer Army is not in numbers, it is in *quality*." Unfortunately, many have either not listened or did not understand, and elected to measure the challenge in numbers alone. What does he mean by quality? Frankly, I'm not sure we have a good handle on that term even today. In the absence of better yardsticks, we measure it in terms of whether a man is a high school graduate or not, whether he is in one IQ type category or another, some measure it in terms of percent black or percent white, or use other primitive-type yardsticks that immediately respond to the challenge of categorizing qualitative talent. Well, I'm sure that

men of your profession know that you cannot tell real quality in the human raw material by years, height, weight, education, IQ, color, or sex. All of you would probably agree that none of those indicators help one whit in reliably measuring proven quality. Yet if I ask you what criteria you would substitute, 99% of you would probably answer, "That's a darned good question." And that's just where we are. We have only framed the question.

However, as chaplains, you provide a latent resource that has not been adequately tapped in helping us to develop more sophisticated definitions of quality. We are not particularly after a college Army, or a high school Army, or a white Army, or a black Army, or an eight-foot Army, or a three-foot Army. We are after a *quality* Army that is equipped to meet the challenges of the insidious threat that I spoke of earlier, a threat which is ill-defined and very, very sophisticated.

Incidentally, all of these quantitative yardsticks that we've discussed might be equally applicable to a discussion of our prison population as well. As a matter of fact, analysis of the data might at first blush even show an enviable higher percentage of high IQ and college graduates in that group than we may be striving for in our new recruits. Quantitative indicators are an aid but not a law unto themselves. In the final analysis, the more subtle and difficult-to-measure qualitative yardsticks which you are more familiar with truly make the big difference.

We in Army management have a mission—a very difficult mission ahead—to meet the challenge of the 1970s and the 1980s. Our relative degree of success will not simply be measured in end strength objectives met, or percentages of soldiers with diplomas, or percentages of soldiers with high IQ categories in the service. One can only truly measure success in terms of the quality of that very difficult commodity called the mind, the spirit and the convictions of our men and women, as individuals and as a team. We want good people. There'll be some that come six-feet high, some that come black, some that come white, some that come from college, and some that don't.

In my judgment, you who are working directly with our men and women are handling about 80% of the Army's "product." I work mostly on materiel, and my worries are mostly about 20% of the Army product equation. Yet sometimes I feel that 80% of our total available management effort is spent on the 20% part of the product, and 20% of our management effort is spent on the critical 80% of the product. As far as I am concerned you are specialists who can help us to move forward by working on that 80% of the product area. More needs to be done. You can help us to move faster, and with a higher consciousness, by set-

ting the standards and by being the bridge between the old Army, whatever that means to you, and the demands of the future, however you postulate them.

Now, I'm afraid I've already waxed too philosophic, but I thought I'd take the risk of closing by bringing a few "coals to Newcastle," by reading an excerpt from *Ephesians:* "In conclusion, be strong, not in yourselves, but in the Lord—in the power of His boundless resource. Therefore, you must wear the whole armor of God that you may be able to resist evil in its day of power and that even when you have fought to a standstill you may still stand your ground. Take your stand then with truth as your belt, righteousness your breastplate, the Gospel of peace firmly on your feet, salvation as your helmet, and in your hand the sword of the spirit, the Word of God. Above all, be sure you take faith as your shield for it can quench every burning missile the enemy hurls at you."

When I was "even younger," I thought that these verses were taking considerable artistic license with reality—the "shields of faith" and so on. As a young man, I knew that true shields to be effective were made of metal or wood or some other hard material.

As I get a little older, and perhaps a little wiser, I realize that my earlier concept was the wrong one, and that one's real armament is more truly measured in terms of the person—of the spirit—of the mind—of the soul.

THE LIKABLE CHAPLAIN

Chaplain (CPT) Thomas M. Warme

Test your imagination. A senior officer is asked to comment on the chaplain who serves his unit. Here's what the officer says of the chaplain: "I didn't like him when he came and I don't like him now—but he's one splendid chaplain!" Does that sound plausible? Or, to test your imagination further, let's suppose that a lower grade enlisted man also comments on the chaplain. He says of him: "I can't say that I like him, really, but he's a fantastic chaplain!" Again, does that sound plausible? With rare exceptions, that is never said. I propose that the prevailing attitude is this: a chaplain who is not liked is a chaplain who is not effective. What concerns me more than any such generalization is what you, a chaplain, believe about this matter. Do you believe you *must* be a likable chaplain?

There's more than an outside chance that scores of troopers feel that their chaplains are the "good guys," the sincere, concerned men who "really" understand. In short, we may get the notion that—in contrast to the line officers—we are the likable fellows.

Then, on the other hand, the fact that we can comfortably associate with officers and receive their compliments ("Best chaplain I ever met!"), might lead us down the broad path of believing that we're just as likable to both officers and enlisted men. And maybe we are—really!

So where's the catch? What's wrong with this? Is someone trying to tell us that there's something wrong with being liked or wanting to be liked? Not at all. Wanting to be liked is no sin. Several years ago, Barbara Streisand recorded a hit song which said that people who need people are the luckiest people in the world. Right on! Moreover, I venture to say that we can agree that an important part of needing people is wanting to be liked by people. By this definition, the luckiest people in the world come in all shapes and sizes and vocations.

There is one vocation, however, whose members seem to have a special need to be liked. That's the clergy. Ever since psychology became a vital ingredient of seminary entrance exams and curricula, we have been told that we may well have chosen this pro-

---

Chaplain Warme is the Assistant Division Chaplain, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, Colorado.

fession because of our need to be liked. Many of us may envision ourselves as kindly men of God in the traditions of Elisha, Jesus, St. Francis of Assisi, and Bing Crosby playing "Good Father Flannigan." These are powerful images. And so are those of the pastors of congregations of our childhood—men who, in our eyes anyway, were beloved by all. Unfortunately, when any of us fails for whatever reason to portray or live up to these traditional images, there's usually someone nearby who suggests that we may have "missed our calling." Worse yet, a departure from the image may cause us to question our own calling and suffer great pains of guilt and doubt.

I remember the uneasy feeling I had the day I discovered that St. Paul and I failed to see eye to eye on some matter. My thoughts ran something like this: "Well, I can live with this difference, but what will others think? Are there people who will consider me an outcast, a heretic?"

One danger we face is that of transforming our NEED to be liked into our MISSION. And that's simply a matter of judging our effectiveness and success mostly in terms of compliments from the command people, or counting the numbers of persons who come to hear us preach, or seek our listening ears in counseling, or favor us with "goodies" of various sorts. But whatever missions are given to us by our ordinations, endorsing agencies, and commanders, they simply MUST be greater than this. The mission is always more than being liked.

How easy it is for us to be blind to the strength of the need to be liked. I recently experienced something which painfully alerted me to the strength of my own need to be liked. My commander, the Alcohol and Drug Control Officer, was desperate to find an officer to run the Drug Rehabilitation Center. In his desperation, he asked me, the drug chaplain, to be the officer-in-charge for a month or so until a replacement arrived. Fine. *Seven months later,* the replacement came. This misplaced chaplain had become the middle man between the ADCO and a DRC staff of approximately 15 people—civilians, officers, NCO's and enlisted counselors. Through the process of implementing the ADCO's directives in the DRC, I learned at a "gut level" how real and strong was my need to be a "likable" chaplain.

There I was—the "boss" to those fifteen people. There is no way any boss can always be liked by everybody. And no matter how valuable he considers the group process to be, there are times when he has to say, "This is not a matter of group process" or "I hear and understand you when you say that you don't like this, but this is the way it has to be" or "I must relieve you."

When I had to say such things to certain people in the DRC, I

felt pangs inside myself. The stronger the pang, the colder and more matter-of-fact I'd be—or try to be. At times I would try to give the message "gently" and "understandingly" which often meant that I was being "slippery" or "weasel-worded." Sometimes, as I experienced discomfort, I'd try to be humorous—tell a dumb anecdote, perhaps. But all was a coverup for the naked fact that I had to say or do something for which someone would not like me. The feeling was real and sometimes painful.

We all know the impossibility of being all things to all people—that we can't always be liked by everybody. All of us know that the price paid for trying to be liked by everyone makes the spender a pitiful person. Even so, we see it happen, and might well weep at what we see.

What, then, can we do? I've already suggested that acknowledging and *accepting our need to be liked* is a healthy first step. My assignment at the DRC was a tremendous help to me in taking this first step. Then, if you're willing to go further, you might *re-examine some of those religious heroes* who set standards and images for us. From what I can see, only when those men of God are romanticized are they altogether likable. Most had the dubious distinction of being despised—some were stoned, some killed. Those like Jesus and Isaiah—who demonstrated a need to be accepted and loved—had to live with their needs and yet carry out their greater mission which frustrated their need to be liked.

There is a third step. *Consider the commander.* He has an awesome responsibility to make decisions which unavoidably invite dislike from other people. He lives in the tension between wanting to be accepted and carrying out the mission. We can take a cue from some of these outstanding commanders, and by observing, discover how they manage to achieve a balance.

I would close, then, with a "call to arms" for us chaplains. No, it is not, "All right chaplains, let's get out there and be *disliked!*" Let it rather be, "Let's be careful that being liked is not too important for us, lest in wanting to be liked, we come to despise ourselves and compromise our mission."

THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN ETHIC AND THE NEW HUMANISM

Chaplain (MAJ) Robert S. Hess

In a large segment of contemporary society there is a mood which contends that the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic is no longer relevant to modern man, that we have moved beyond it to a new humanism which must replace a transcendent ethic for one existentially determined. What is this new humanism? Is it an ethic? From whence did it come? How does it compare and contrast with the Judeo-Christian ethic? How can the chaplain approach the Army leadership to articulate his ethical foundation?

There are those who believe the new humanism is, in reality, a faith—built upon concepts which are part and parcel of the Judeo-Christian tradition. If this be so, then it is difficult to understand why reasonable men would refuse to admit it. Faith is so very obviously a part of human experience. Can it be any less real than any other aspect of humanness?

It may be wondered if any ethic can be entirely based on the transcendent. It may equally be wondered if any ethic can be entirely humanistic.

THE ISSUES INVOLVED

Something is wrong with modern man. What is it? How do we know what is wrong—or what is right?

Ethics is a system for determining what is right and wrong. The Judeo-Christian system is a traditional ethic which has succeeded in winning the varied allegiance of nearly one-third of the present world population.[1] While the moral-ethical items of the Judeo-Christian tradition are, in many instances, common to other transcendental systems, not all people accept transcendental standards of measurement. To some, these systems speak of theologies and ethereal philosophies which do not "bake bread" in the ovens of "gut-level" humanity.

Moral-ethical systems which look outside of man for their standards, do so for the very reason that human nature is suspect;

[1] "Major World Religions," *Reader's Digest 1973 Almanac and Yearbook* (Pleasantville, New York, 1973) p. 502. One billion Christians and fourteen million Jews are cited.

Chaplain Hess is the Staff Chaplain, DISCOM, 9th Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Washington. This article is based upon studies and interviews conducted while Chaplain Hess was attending the Chaplain Officers Advanced Course at USACHS, Fort Hamilton, New York

that man, left to himself and unaided, would short-change himself in setting his own standards of ethical conduct because he is inadequately equipped to do so.

In the eyes of the humanist, a transcendental moral-ethical system is more interested in applying one theological position to society than in using the problems of society to pose new challenges for theology as a discipline. Conversely, the theologian suspects the humanist of not setting his value sights highly enough, that is, to extend beyond contemporary society.[2]

James Gustafson suggests that tension in Christian ethics has persisted between the ethics of disposition, intention, conscience and ethics of law, norms and standards, and that these tensions are still alive in the presence of an anti-legalistic mood.[3]

What forms the conscience which governs our choices, responses, and acts? How can an objective ethic be developed? The Judeo-Christian answers: God and the Scriptures, reason and faith, respectively.

Morality is concerned with:

1. Fair play and harmony between individuals (relations between men).
2. Harmonizing the things inside each man.
3. Harmonizing human life as a whole (relations between man and the power that made him).[4]

Modern people nearly always are thinking about the first and forgetting the other two, whereas the range and context of morality is quite inclusive.[5]

The humanist has traditionaly emphasized the sufficiency of man-focused attentions. The theist sees man's origin, presence,

---

[2] Thus the theologian has been accused (and it seems, at times, rightly so) of being uninterested in the here-and-now.

[3] James M. Gustafson, "What is the Contemporary Problematic of Ethics in Christianity?" *Judaism and Ethics*, ed. by Daniel J. Silver (New York: KIAV Publishing House, Inc., 1970) pp. 49–67.

[4] C. S. Lewis, *Christian Behavior* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1946) pp. 2, 5.

[5] The range is indicated by the following list I gleaned from the index of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1955).

Abortion	Faith	Radicalism
Art	Family	Reason
Asceticism	Films	Responsibility
Capital Punishment	Freedom	Revolution
Church	Friendship	Science
Confession	Good	Sex
Conformation	Hypocrisy	Sin
Conscience	Idealism	Slavery
Contraception	Justification	Socialism
Corporal Punishment	Labour	State
Death	Life	Sterilization
Disserters	Lying	Suicide
Duty	Meditation	Technology
Economics	Nationalism	Torture
Education	Optimism	Truthfulness
Euthanasia	Passivity	Vocation
Evil	Pharisaism	War

and future in God. In the latter view, man's immediate present is of secondary import. The humanist, on the other hand, is concerned only with a future confined to this present life—for that, in his opinion, is all the life (future) that can be known.

THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN ETHIC

Should mankind grow into a workable world society, a unified ethics would be a necessity. Moral systems would need to be mutually compatible, that is, if they are clearly distinct.[6]

The Judeo-Christian ethic looks at life from a theistic perspective. The problems of humanity require answers which humanity (unaided) cannot provide. The Judeo-Christian holds that humanity (human nature) is *part* of the problem.

The perspective of the Judeo-Christian ethic is that of considering the goals of humanity and of locating principles for man's behavior. For the Christian this means seeing with the guiding "eyes" of the law of God and the person of Jesus Christ. The Jewish faith is one "whose central obligation is the 'yoke of the commandments.' " The Torah traditions marked a clear way that man should go (halacha), and above this was the saintly way (midat hasiduth).[7] Jesus and the New Testament ethic exhorts us to care. He set the example. Thus the Judeo-Christian ethic is based on guidance which comes from outside of fickle human nature. The Judeo-Christian ethic holds a concept of common care in which the conceptual framework of Judaism and Christianity are contiguous.[8] The Old Testament ethic is summarized in the Ten Commandments which were accepted by Jesus, enlarged upon to include the "spirit of the law," and summarized in the great commandment concerning love for God and neighbor. "The complement in the Gospel to this radical ethic of obedience is the message of the love, the mercy, and the forgiveness of God.[9]

The perspective of the Judeo-Christian ethic includes man's sin, not because it's a desirable memoir, but because that concept has such an obvious relationship to life. It's realistic. The Judeo-Christian ethic perceives that all the efforts of man—noble as they are—fall short of inspiring men in general to hope beyond the confines of this life. If men are not thus inspired, their efforts take on some air of futility.

---

[6] For suggestion in working out this task, see Dr. Wolf LePenies, "Difficulties of Basing Ethics on Anthropology," in *Man In A New Society*, ed. by Frank Bockle (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972).

[7] Silver, *Judaism and Ethics*, p. 3.

[8] Silver, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

[9] Gilmour S. MacLean, "Religion and Theology of the New Testament," *Encyclopedia Americana*. 1968, III, p. 709. It is interesting that while some emphasize that the ethic of Christ is impossible to follow (and therefore contend it cannot be meant for modern man), the Christian refers to the mercy and forgiveness of God rather than try to invalidate the ethic.

The Bible and Christ (the Model) interpreted by reason operating in the realm of faith, have been the guides of Judeo-Christianity. That these guides dare to apply to all situations at all times is thoroughly challenged in the (continuing) situation ethics debate.

> An ethic cannot be a book in which there is set out how everything in the world actually ought to be. An ethicist cannot be a man who always knows better than others what is to be done and how it is to be done. [10]

For situationism, ethics is determined by the time and place, leading us away from any kind of abstract ethic which may be applied concretely. A classic quote of Bonhoeffer that sets some of the groundwork for situation ethics is: "Principles are only tools in the hand of God, soon to be thrown away as unserviceable . . . there are times when principles become wrong even when they are right." [11]

For another situationist, ethics is the appropriate method for the new morality which stays "as close to the law as possible, yet departing as far from it as need be." [12] It does admit to one absolute: *Love.*[13] Situation ethics claims to be at once more lenient and more stringent than law morality.[14] In situation ethics, love and justice are synonymous.

Situationism may fail to consider that man is always acting within a community that cannot exist without law. Although "the moral confusion of this generation is not due to the new morality but to the breakdown of the old," [15] it must be fairly recognized that the very name *situation ethics* implies that the old morality needs breaking down . . . and proceeds in an attempt to do so. Ethics may indeed be more useful when the proper ethic is applied to the proper situation, but who is to determine when and what is relative? [16]

I have chosen to wade through situation ethics (even if only ankle-deep) before coming to the more raging waters of the new

[10] Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, p. 23.

[11] Quoted by William Barclay, *Ethics In A Permissive Society* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971) p. 81.

[12] Harvey Cox, ed., *The Situation Ethics Debate* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968) p. 249. This book was written to give representative responses to Joseph Fletcher, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966) which Cox calls "an idea whose hour has come."

[13] Fletcher describes this love as "freedom to put human need before anything else." Cf. his "Reflection and Reply," in *The Situation Ethics Debate, op. cit.*, pp. 249–264.

[14] Fletcher says: "We cannot absolute both love and law, and the New Testament makes it perfectly clear which one to choose." *Ibid.*, p. 251.

[15] Dean Charles H. Buck, Jr., in a sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral, Boston, October 30, 1966.

[16] Bonhoeffer leaves me in amazement when he defines ethics as the "gauge for judging actions and behavior when the moral course is not self-evident," and then calls this a "refreshing *simplification* (italics added) of the problems of life." *Ethics*, pp. 233–4.

humanism. It was important to do this, I believe, because situation ethics and the "new morality" which floated about for some time, have provided the appropriate spawning ground for the new awakening of a challenging humanism.

> If all men were Saints, then situation ethics would be the perfect ethics . . . but man has not yet come of age. Man, therefore, still needs the crutch and the protection of law. If man is to make his own decisions, we must make man morally and lovingly fit to make that decision. [17]

HUMANISM AS A PRESENT ALTERNATIVE

One hundred and twenty religious leaders, philosophers, writers, and social scientists recently signed *The Humanist Manifesto II* which criticizes religious dogmatism and stresses that humans alone must solve the problems that threaten existence on earth. Humanism offers its creed as an "alternative that can serve present-day needs and guide mankind toward the future." [18] The items in *Manifesto II* are presented as they are because it has been forty years since *Humanist Manifesto I* appeared, and events since then make that statement "far too optimistic." The Manifesto purports that looking to faith, or deities, or theologies of hope, are flights "in despair from reason" which are not taken by those who are informed.[19]

Humanism begins with humans, not God; nature, not deity. It claims to believe "in the cultivation of feeling and love."

The humanist accuses the religionist of living only for the future when real humanity is "the actual constitution of human existence." [20] There is a possibility that humanism, while purporting to be open-eyed and realistic, is really hampered by a negativism that it mistakes for positivism.[21] I believe, however, that in its best sense, humanism is committed to a vision of humanity as a whole—even though it tries to do this without religious or theological references.

While humanism traces its roots from ancient China, classical Greece and Rome, through the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, the *new* humanism is a product of the second half of this century and claims to mark a "renewed celebration of the dignity of

---

[17] Barclay, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

[18] "No deity will save us, we must save ourselves," appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, August 26, 1973 and is presented in full in *the Humanist* Journal, XXXIII, (Sept., Oct., 1973) pp. 4–9.

[19] It is interesting that the items in *Manifesto II* are referred to as "a vision of hope." *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[20] Heinz Schlette, "Utopian Thinking and Real Humanity." Bockle, *Man In Society*, p. 84.

[21] This negativism has been admitted by some humanists. Cf. Richard LaPiere, "The Apathetethic," *Morality and Mental Health*, ed. by O. Hobart Mower (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967) pp. 505–13. LaPiere says, "Humanism stems from and is based on a Freudian concept of man . . . which is negative." As such, humanism may be an ethic of escape, for humans respond more positively to moral principles than to natural instincts.

man."[22] Humanism spews indignation at the behavior of man which has been brutal, brutalizing and guilt-producing, while, at the same time, it expresses concern with human possibilities resulting in hope for the future.

I propose that if we can succeed in getting man spiritually free, he will care not only for his own human needs, but will help care for those same needs in others. I suggest that humanism may be alarmingly shallow where it fails to see that man was made for so much more than this life and will not long do without the deeper dimensions of the human spirit (the transcendent).[23] The Judeo-Christian must also guard against the old (and the present) mistake of trying to keep matters of faith separate from human experience.

THE CHALLENGE TO JUDEO-CHRISTIANITY

The Judeo-Christian must be thoroughly involved in the present.[24] I recommend the continual offering of messages of uncompromising purity and the performance of loving acts of meaning which inform human living.

The chaplain articulates the ethical foundation in which he stands by virtue of his position. He may remember that he is sought out because he is a chaplain. The children of God to whom he ministers have some notion of what that means. The chaplain will keep informed and develop skills of communication and counsel which speak of his ethical foundation.

Then there's the matter of personal integrity and moral sensitivity:

> No nation can survive unless they can depend on a far higher degree of morality among their military leaders than they find throughout society in general.[25]

We in the Army chaplaincy have received no reason to believe that the Army leadership does not want us to interpret the traditional ethical code upon which we are founded and in which we stand.

---

[22] For an excellent perspective of the new humanism, see Roger Shinn's very readable, *Man: The New Humanism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968). Shinn notes some reasons for the new humanism as: Man's achievements and opportunities, historical crises, de-humanizing effects of institutions and technology, the awareness of religious pluralism, and even changes in Biblical theology to include an increased concern for "all flesh."

[23] For whatever spiritual future there *may* be (and humanism has absolutely no reason to conclude that there will not be any), humanism offers neither preparation nor hope. The earthly life—even if lived in fullness of peace and plenty—is insufficient. This is evidenced by those who achieve the "fullness" of earthly life and yet choose to leave it. Thus, in denying the spirit of man as being the true man, and refusing to acknowledge that man longs for something more than anything life has been capable of producing, humanism short-changes the very human it wishes to fulfill.

[24] Cf. *The Christian Century*, October 31, 1973.

[25] Chaplain (Major General) Gerhardt W. Hyatt, Chief of Chaplains, US Army. Address delivered at the U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School on 14 June 1972.

The humanist is evidently convinced that the world would be more humane if saturated with a humanistic philosophy rather than a theistic one. I suspect this conviction is fed by the general impression that those who advocate theism are too lax in applying its tenets. If I am correct in my observation on this point, my immediate reaction is: Will society indeed be better off permeated with humanistic principles rather than theistic ones? The problem seems to be more one of a "weak flesh" rather than the lack of spirit (in either theism *or* humanism). I suggest that we need more than a philosophy to change the tenor of human life.

Somewhere there must be actions which are so consistent with philosophy that the human is emancipated from his inhibiting restrictions which often appear as "freedom"; and where he is transformed to a freedom *in* bondage.[26] This would allow the human to be fully human by recognizing—and ministering to—his spirit as being a part (and possibly the most valuable "part") of the total man.

It is my conviction that reality is the best therapy. Everybody wants truth—merciless as it may be. But the question is: Does truth itself extend beyond what we sense—beyond the present life and beyond what we can conceive this life as becoming? The Christian theist believes it does.[27] It remains for the humanist to show it does not.

Corliss Lamont says:

> Since the humanist thinks that his one and only life is in the here and now, he aims to make the best of it in terms of attaining happiness for himself, his family, his countrymen, and all mankind . . . faith in immortality has often cut the nerve of effective action for improving the lot of humanity on this earth.[28]

It is an inconsistency for the humanist to say that he believes death gives the opportunity for the largest possible number of human beings . . . to experience the joys of living . . . and (thus) acts as the firm ally of future and unborn generations, and yet desires the extension of our individual natural life, encourages contraception, and supports abortion.

---

[26] Bondage to the "here-and-now" plus bondage to the personification of a philosophy which includes a future that is both "now" and "not yet."

[27] He believes this so strongly that he has been—and still is—willing to die for that faith. The belief in immortality is admittedly based on the doctrine of resurrection—and specifically on the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Men were convinced of this resurrection by seeing the resurrected Person. Many died for this conviction. If the resurrection were not true, these men would certainly have known it. Men do not willingly die for what they know to be a lie.

[28] Corliss Lamont. "The Crisis Called Death" in *Moral Problems in Contemporary Society*, ed. by Paul Kurtz (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1969) pp. 281–298. The illustration Lamont uses for this point is quite unfitting and unconvincing as to the truth of his point—as Lamont himself so implies (p. 282).

Some of us believe we can fulfill these "aims" better by faith and hope for this life as a part of eternal life. I have real trouble seeing how I could attain any more "happiness for myself, my family, my countrymen, and all mankind" by relinquishing this faith and hope. I fail to see how this faith and hope inhibits humans from being fully human. I fail to understand how this faith and hope can be considered to be unreasonable and unintelligent. Conversely, I perceive the invitation to drop transcendental faith and hope and be entirely "this-worldly minded," as *not* being a loving act. This invitation is not an indication that humanists are, in fact, interested in my happiness, the happiness of my family, of my countrymen, or of all mankind.

Can we all live with the notion that:

> Where the humanist performs acts of love, he is theistic. Where the theist performs acts of love, he is humanistic. The thought of being both may do each much good. If it does, humanity would be the winner. What is most important is that acts of love be performed.[29]

I find it not insignificant that in all my reading on humanism, I have found very little written on the subject of love. I find this difficult to understand since humanism wants to minister to humans and love is such an evident part of human need. I can surmise that part of the reason for this draught of love-talk is because the humanist has seen so little of love expressed to him by those of us who purport to be love's advocates. If this be so, then it is certainly to our shame. Finding fault in others is an easy pastime which seems to come so naturally; self-examination is a chore. I also surmise that it has been harder for the humanist to talk about what humanistic acts of love are than to state that the theist has not been performing them. I believe, therefore, that the humanist's reason and honesty will eventually impel him to deal with this.

Corliss Lamont says: "I sympathize with everyone who ever longed for immortality and I wish that the enchanting dream of eternal life could indeed come true." [30]

Mr. Lamont expresses the desires of anyone who appreciates and enjoys life when he requests to be shown that life exists after death. This I cannot prove to him. What can we prove to anybody? There is still in existence a society for the propagation of the theory of a flat earth. Now there *may* indeed be more evidence that the earth is round than there is "proof" of immortality. But I remember hearing Dr. Werner Von Braun speaking on the subject of immortality and saying that science has proven that *nothing* entirely disappears without a trace—a physical trace—

[29] This is my over-riding spirit, attitude, and ethos.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

not even the tiniest leaf from a tree. If this be true for a tiny leaf, how is it so hard to accept it for a man? I suspect the saddening truth is that the non-believer *cannot* be shown and the believer *need not* be shown. Ah, faith, you priceless gift—creator of problems? Yes, honestly, some; but solver of so many more.[31]

The longing for immortality (evidence your own longing), and the belief in immortality is somehow imposed upon us. (Where did man *ever* get the *idea* of immortality?) There is a sense in which we will only think of that immortality in terms of fulfillment because the conviction of the truth of immortality requires also a reflection on the implications of eternal existence. We do know that existence here and now requires courage. From the human vantage point (the line of sight to which we most easily resort), the degree of courage required for immortality—the courage to be eternally—must be unfathomably awesome. The Christian theist needs every bit of the optimism he can muster from his faith to think of immortality in humanistic terms.

Mr. Lamont offers that the humanist's "main antidote for death is preoccupation with life." [32] The Christian theist does not look on death as an "ailment" needing any antidote. He would rather offer that real life is dying to the idea that life here and now is all there is. The Christian theist wants to *add to* life; not subtract from it. At this point I am satisfied that humanism wants the same. The differences continue in what is meant by *life*.

If it were possible for humanism to succeed in destroying a theism which has provided answers to the questions of the meaning and purpose of life, humanity would still be confronted with the question of life's meaning and purpose. The question will neither disappear nor be solved by ignoring it. Further, humans seem incapable of ignoring it.

---

[31] I realize that this statement may be interpreted as unkind, or as an attempt to reinforce a "weak" theology. Sincerely, it is not meant to be either. As I continue in my life I become increasingly more convinced of two things: One—that faith is a genuine part—and a very necessary part—of reality and, Two—that I am only now coming to really care for those who have no hope. Only now am I really feeling the pains of love for those who have the glad capability of thoroughly loving and enjoying this life—so much so that they sincerely wish to retain it—and yet have no knowledge (and thus no hope) for anything more than this life. It is they who would so much appreciate and enjoy continued life—and having such a hope, would so much *more* appreciate, enjoy and serve in this life.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

THE BLACK EXPERIENCE IN THE MILITARY CHAPEL

Chaplain (MAJ) John C. Pearson

One word describes the Black experience in the military chapel. That word is alienation. The sense of alienation, though always present, is often sublimated and seldom dealt with forthrightly. Even Blacks who come from middle-class churches experience alienation on the new ecclesiastical turf whose occupants have no special affinity for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Classes of basic and advanced NCOs—Black and white—were asked to report on their experiences in the military chapel. Their responses—after being consolidated, contrasted, and analyzed—indicated that many Black NCOs feel uncomfortable and alienated in the military chapel. Should these responses reflect, and I believe they do, what other Blacks experience in chapel, then we chaplains need to become more aware of this phenomenon. It is essential, however, to view these reports in the light of their historical background and contemporary situation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The United States Armed Forces have been acclaimed over the years as the most integrated institutions in America. That claim is without serious challenge. Yet, as if to validate the position of Blacks who no longer view integration as a means of Black self-determination, racism in the Armed Forces lingers on as it does in the church and in the larger American society. The American way of life and the church have arms which reach into the military community. This has been the case from the very beginning of the American way of life and of the early church in America.

In 1787, slavery was explicitly recognized in the Constitution. In 1793, when the cotton gin was invented, Congress passed the Fugitive Slave Law. A deteriorating future for American Negroes seemed certain.

> The equalitarian enthusiasm of the Revolutionary years was clearly on the wane—a trend best symbolized by the growing

---

Chaplain Pearson is the service school chaplain at the U.S. Army Quartermaster School, Fort Lee, Virginia.

segregation and exclusion of Negroes in the hitherto often interracial and relatively equalitarian Methodist and Baptist Churches.[1]

It was necessary, of course, for the churches to back their actions with theology. James Cone documents white theology which backed the churches' action by quoting a white Bishop:

> Christianity, and the embracing of the Gospel, does not make the least Alteration in Civil property, or in any of the duties which belongs to Civil Relations; but in all these Respects, it continues Persons in just the same State as it found them. The Freedom which Christianity gives, is a Freedom from Bondage of Sin and Satan, and from the Dominion of Men's Lust and Passion and inordinate Desires; but as to their outward condition, whatever that was before, whether bond or free, their being baptized and becoming Christians, makes no matter of Change in it.[2]

So, under the political and economic pressure which was in vogue, the church backed away from its outward and equalitarian thrust. The church turned to an inward and exclusive spirituality which, for the most part, remains with us today.

THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION

The Black experience in the military chapel is a neglected subject. Perhaps there are those who will remind me that not much is written on the *white* experience in the military chapel. The difference in the white and the Black experience in this context is that the military chapel is white and, therefore, there is little reason for pastoral concern about the white experience beyond the well-known pastoral concerns of any parish. The statement that the military chapel is white means that for every 50 or 60 Black chaplains leading mixed, but predominantly white congregations in the Army, there are approximately 1300 white chaplains performing that function.

Even on those few occasions when Black chaplains are in the position of leadership in the military chapel, more often than not they are chaplains schooled in white or Black seminaries that are white oriented. I feel cheated because I went through seminary without reading one word that a Black man spoke or wrote about religion, theology or the church. If anyone is so undeveloped in social sensitivity to wonder why that is important, then he or she should ask *academe:* Why did you not consider the contribution of Black persons important enough to include it in the curriculum of a Black institution of learning? The answer is that "if you are white, you are right, and if you are Black, get back."

Ironically, my seminary was called a "Black" seminary. Yet it

[1] John H. Bracey, Jr., *Black Nationalism in America* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970) p. 30.

[2] James Cone, *Black Theology and Black Power* (New York: Seabury Press, 1969) p. 75.

has produced clergymen who fit neatly into the white military chapel (or church) without additional orientation. In some respects, some Black chaplains fit better into the white church than they do in the Black church. Think about it. In most instances, the Black chaplain has studied white theology and culture. Furthermore, the predominantly white military congregations, by the overwhelming influence of its expectations, take up where the seminary leaves off. It lures the Black chaplain away from the Black experience to the white side of the house. A few Black seminaries, however, which have scrubbed off some of the "whitewash" in the last 5 or 6 years, have provided the military with a few chaplains.

Even today, most of us are not familiar with Black culture, Black theologians and Black ethicists whose works and thoughts have been systematically omitted from the curriculum of many seminaries. For instance, Thomas Altizer and William Hamilton's radical theology ("God is dead.") made the seminary scene while Francis Grimke's theology of hope never surfaced. Grimke, a Black theologian, said:

> God is not dead—nor is he an onlooker at what is going on in the world. One day he will make requisition for blood; he will call the oppressor to account. Justice may sleep, but it never dies. The individual, race or nation which does wrong, which sets at defiance God's great law, especially God's law of love, of brotherhood, will be sure, sooner or later, to pay the penalty.[3]

His words seem to be in rhythm with the heartbeat of the Bible. A few of the other important literary classics written by Black people about Black people, and which were published at the time I attended seminary, but which have been omitted from the main stream of Christian education are: *The Life and Experience of Gospel Labor,* Richard Allen; *The Negro's God,* Benjamin E. Mays; *Souls of Black Folks,* W. E. B. DuBois; *The Mission Work of the AME Church,* Booker T. Washington; *The Christian Recorder,* Henry M. Turner (the first Black Chaplain to serve in the Army).

Such omissions from any chaplain's education and the absence of Blacks from his ministry seem logically to make him somewhat inept for ministering to Blacks fresh from the inner city or grain field. The chaplain must make a special effort to acquaint himself with the vitality of the Black community and Black culture. The special effort that most Black chaplains must make to prepare themselves for ministering to Blacks can be made by any chaplain who has the inclination.

---

[3] Gayraud Wilmore, *Black Religion and Black Radicalism* (New York: Anchor Press, 1973) p. 102.

It seems that the transition of laymen from the Black church to the military chapel is a phenomenon different from that which white laymen experience when they transfer from a white church to the military chapel. When the Black soldier transfers to the military chapel, he experiences differences of a magnitude exceeding the differences experienced by whites. Whatever other reasons there may be which account for the differences Blacks experience when they move from the civilian church to the military chapel, the racial ethos is one.

A SURVEY OF THE BLACK EXPERIENCE IN CHAPEL

After contemplating a method for getting at the Black experience in the military chapel, the following decisions were made:

1. A survey would be made using questionnaires.

2. Students in the NCO basic classes 73–15 and 16 and NCO advanced class 73–5 of the Quartermaster NCO School were selected as the target group because they comprised the best cross-section of the population. These classes were composed of soldiers on temporary duty from installations in every region of the country. Their ages ranged from the twenties to the fifties. Educational levels ranged from below high school in the case of a few junior NCOs to the completion of four years of college. Care was taken not to abuse the chaplain-instructor relationship with the students. Detailed explanations were given and no one was forced to complete the questionnaire. Consequently, those completing the questionnaires did so voluntarily and as a courtesy. Junior and senior NCOs from several military installations would be the target group.

3. The questionnaire should ask for:

a. Personal
b. Ethnic/religious background
c. Attitudes toward worship
d. Perceptual responses to worship experiences
e. "Feeling" responses to worship experiences
f. Behavioral responses to worship experiences

The responses to two inquiries: (1) "Describe briefly the kind of worship experience you like" and (2) "If I have not asked all the right questions, comment on your religious experience on the military installation," clearly point to a problem in asking laymen, some of whom are not confessing Christians, to express themselves theologically. Fifty-one (51) of eighty-three (83) failed to respond to the two inquires above or responded with only a question mark. Those who did attempt to respond were relatively un-

successful. However, multiple choice questions were asked so that the soldiers could respond more precisely and readily. The following personal, ethnic, religious, behavioral, perceptual, and "feeling" data were gathered.

QUESTIONNAIRE CODE

Letters "A" through "O" mean:

A—Worship on-post
B—Worship off-post
C—No worship experience
D—Difference in sermon on/off-post
E—No difference in sermon on/off-post
F—Do not know if sermon is different on/off-post
G—Mode of worship different on/off-post
H—Do not know if mode of worship is different on/off-post
I—Mode of worship not different on/off-post
J—Selected positive feeling words to describe worship experience on-post
K—Responded to negative feeling words to describe worship experience on-post
L—Mixed or no response to feeling words to describe worship experience on-post
M—Assigned to one or more units receiving support from a Black chaplain
N—Average years of service
O—Number completing the questionnaire

Line Numbers "1" *through* "5" *mean:*

1. Black Protestants
2. White Anglo-Saxon Protestants
2. White Catholic
4. Black Catholic
5. Protestants—unidentified ethnic background

The responses to these questions are categorized in Table One. Although Mexican, Oriental and Latin American Protestants, Catholics and Hindus were included in the survey, the number was not statistically significant.

The Black experience (line 1, Table One) can best be understood in contrast with the white experience (line 2, Table One). It is different from line 1 in ethnicity alone. Lines 3 through 5 (the other ethnic groups identified) show contrast both in race and religion.

A good indicator of one's likes and dislikes is the way one functions. Lines 1a through 1c show the *functional* religious be-

TABLE ONE

CHAPEL WORSHIP EXPERIENCES BY ETHNIC-RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Line No.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	5	14	2	18	2	1	17	2	2	10	7	4	4	14	21
2	11	18	5	16	11	7	18	7	9	15	9	10	5	10	34
3	4	5	1	4	5	1	3	1	6	7	2	1	0	8	10
4	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	3
5	1	4	0	3	1	1	4	1	0	2	0	3	1	11	5

havior of the Black soldier. Twenty-six percent of the worshiping Black soldiers preferred to worship on-post; seventy-four percent preferred to worship off-post. This is an indicator of the sense of alienation they experience in the military chapel. Lines 2a through 2c show that only five percent more whites than Blacks preferred to worship on-post, but an impressive twenty-one percent less whites than Blacks preferred to worship off-post. It is a safe assumption that ninety-nine percent of the whites who worship off-post are worshiping in all-white churches, and the same percentage of Blacks are worshiping in all-Black churches.

J. Deotis Roberts gives the reason why Blacks prefer Black worship:

> Black worship, composed of Gospel, spirituals, sermons, and prayers must provide refreshment and renewal for travel-weary pilgrims in Black skin. "Nobody Knows the Trouble I've Seen" and "Sometimes I Feel Like a Motherless Child" makes immediate contact with the Black experience. When such pieces are rendered in white churches, they are art, but in Black churches, they are worship. When whites and Blacks with the white outlook hear these songs, it is for them an *aesthetic* experience, but when those who are the Black poor—and those Blacks who still remember their own past and who empathize with the present experience of the majority of Blacks—hear these songs, the spirit descends—it is worship.[4]

This does more than show why a large number of Black soldiers will drive past a dozen white churches, whose doors are open to them, to worship in a Black church. It also suggests why a smaller number of Blacks worship in the military chapel. Dr. E. Franklin Frazier, who also was critical of "Blacks with the white outlook," zooms in more sharply on the reason why twenty-six percent of the worshiping Blacks worship in the military chapel.

[4] J. Deotis Roberts, *Liberation and Reconciliation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971) p. 126.

Frazier wrote:

> Here we are interested in the outlook of the new middle class which has become important among Negroes during the past twenty years or so. It is the class whose outward appearance and standard of behavior approximate most nearly the norms of the white American society.[5]

Roberts asserts that, *en masse*, Blacks are a religiously gullible people and are available prey for any man or woman. That is apparently true, for "Sister Ann" and "Sister Sophia" would not pay to have their phone numbers piped over the radio to listening Black audiences with the promise:
"If you tell me your problems today you will be rid of them tomorrow." The price of advertising would not be worthwhile should people not be responsive. Beyond this phenomenon, I wonder if the middle-class Negroes that Frazier described are not religiously gullible when they adopt the white outlook and sit in the white church. The affirmative is suggested by Cone:

> With its all white congregations, it makes racism a respectable attitude. By remaining silent it creates an ethos which dehumanizes Blacks. It is the church which preaches that Blacks are inferior to whites—if not by *word*, certainly by "moral" example.[6]

To affirm the truth of that statement, however, does not deny other facts concerning those Black worshipers who regularly worship in the military chapel. Some Blacks simply remain convinced that if they do as whites do and show whites how "nice" they are, then whites will like them as their equals. Perhaps it would be more to the point to say that some whites do like them as "their" Negroes. Too many Negroes do not know the difference between being liked as an *equal* and being liked as a *Negro*. This is not due to ignorance but to the use of repression. The whole bad feeling of alienation is pushed into the subconscious mind. Blacks who do this are used energetically by whites to counterattack other Blacks who are determined to deal with alienation by defining their own values and life styles.

Mr. Black "Nice Guy" and Mr. Black with the white outlook are among those who worship in the military chapel. There are others who sublimate their alienation successfully. Forty-seven percent, or almost half of the worshipers in black skin who sit in the military chapel, made positive feeling responses when asked about their experiences; three percent more than whites. However, Blacks made seven percent more negative feeling responses than whites. In light of white theology and the position of James Cone

---

[5] E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Church in America* (New York: Schoken Books, Inc., 1973) p. 75.

[6] Cone, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

quoted above, a forty-seven percent positive response by Blacks worshiping in the military chapel is amazing! It suggests that God can and does transcend cultural and social circumstances as he speaks to human life. There is precedence for this statement. God spoke to the slave through a religion introduced to them by early white missionaries which "encouraged escape from the world and submission to slavery in the hope of paradise when life was over . . ." [7] Yet, God let the slaves sublimate when they heard:

> . . . the story of the deliverance of the Jews from slavery as the prototype of racial and nationalistic redemption—the divine revelation of the trans-historical meaning of the historical experience.[8]

If the word of God could then transcend the bias of men, why not now? Therefore, any word that would seem to impugn the integrity of the Black worshiper in the military chapel should be guarded.

It would not reflect the whole story to end this discussion without mentioning the exceptional white minister or chaplain who deals with Black alienation forthrightly. The exceptional minister is not without historical precedence as Gayraud S. Wilmore points out:

> All in all, it is fair to assume that the opening up of the whole issue of human equality in the context of the gospel and the moral right, under the Christian religion, of the slave to escape or resist enslavement, was due in no small measure to the agitation of a few intrepid whites who transmitted the egalitarian spirit of the American Revolution and radical Christianity to secret gatherings of the plantation slave.[9]

The writer has worked with a few intrepid white chaplains. In all honesty, however, it should be pointed out that they are, by far, in the minority. But it should be noted that some Blacks do receive an intrepid ministry from these white chaplains in the military chapel.

The most telling datum located—reflecting the racial ethos in the Black NCO's experience in the military chapel—is shown on lines 1 and 2d-i. This datum deals with the NCO's perception of the sermon or message and the mode of worship in the military chapel as compared to the off-post church experience. A surprising ninety percent of the Black NCOs, who claimed an acquaintance with worship, reported that the message is different on-post than it is off-post. A little less than sixty percent of the whites felt the sermon is different off-post. Ninety percent of the Blacks claim

---

[7] Wilmore, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

to know that the mode of worship was different off-post as compared to seventy-two percent of the whites.

However, lines 1 and 2d-i would be used incorrectly if they were used to say that all respondents agreed in their judgment as to *which place* of worship was best for them. Opinions are mixed on this point. The NCOs were not asked to make comments on their on-post/off-post choices of worship. Yet a few of them felt strongly enough about the questions to comment anyway. I think it is significant to note a few of their comments:

1. The chaplains do not push for money.
2. Most off-post services are money oriented.
3. Negro gospel singing is not available on-post.
4. Off-post services are more like the ones I was raised in.
5. I like it quiet, no shouting.

Statements 1 and 2 do not represent a plus for either the military chapel or the civilian church, but probably a minus for both. The three remaining statements—unsolicited subject areas—are more relevant to our theme.

When a Black soldier says, "I like to worship off-post because the service is more like the one in the church I was raised in," it's hard for whites and middle-class Blacks—who feel that they have the last word about church—to understand his attitude. Whether whites and middle-class Negroes know it or not, a mode of worship like that depicted by James Weldon Johnson in *God's Trombone* meets the religious needs of thousands of Blacks.[10] Even more explicitly than shown in *God's Trombone,* is the fact that prophetic utterance of social justice is essential in Black preaching.

Dr. E. Franklin Frazier raised the subject of the Negro spiritual. When discussing the "Negro," he wrote:

> They continue to be influenced in their thinking and especially in their feelings and sentiment by the social heritage of the Negro which is preserved by the spirituals and the religious orientation toward the world contained in them.[11]

So, it is not at all surprising when a Black NCO says he worships off-post because "Negro spirituals are not available on-post." They form an integral part of his religious experience.

The comment about "shouting" represents only the Black soldier. That is not surprising, but it is significant, that the subject comes out negatively. Since shouting or religious dance is part of the Black religious African heritage, negative comments, therefore, seem to point out Black apostasy, if not cultural heresy.

Line 1n is important when compared to line 2n or any of the

---

[10] James Weldon Johnson, *God's Trombone* (New York: Viking Press, 1963).
[11] Frazier, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

other lines on the "n" column. Be reminded that the questionnaires were completed by NCO students. They were receiving training which gave them important merit points which helped them to qualify for promotions. The Black NCOs had 3 to 4 years longer time in service than any other group reporting. Remembering that the completion of these courses is essential to the NCO's career development, it then becomes obvious that the Black soldier's career development is slower than the white soldier's. The reasons for this range from premilitary inferior education to command discretion or bias. In any event, it is a condition resulting from racism. And when the exponents of the Gospel overlook racism, they overlook an urgent concern of Blacks. Blacks, who think Black, refuse to accept an interpretation of the Gospel which is unrelated to social concern.

CONCLUSION

The indications of this survey may seem unrealistic since eighty-five percent of the whites and ninety percent of the Blacks who completed the survey responded to questions about worship. The percentage of worshipers in any community is not that high. No claim, however, is made that these NCOs are regular in their worship attendance. They were only asked to respond to as many items on the questionnaire as they could. Religious or not, they knew their minds and hearts.

Nonetheless, they have stimulated the following recommendations which might assist chaplains who seek to minister to the needs of the whole community.

1. All chaplains—white and Black—should make a concerted effort to recognize covert as well as overt racism and help others to recognize it. One reason why sensitivity training is not looked upon with endearment by some is because it is more comfortable to let emotionally disturbing things, like racism, remain repressed. Cross-reading, moreover, can arouse one's awareness of racism. By cross-reading the writer refers to a conservative who reads liberal publications, or a liberal who reads conservative publications, or a person of European extraction who reads some Afro-American materials, or an Afro-American who reads European materials. But cross-reading is not accomplished until the reader, at least provisionally, accepts a point of view that is different from his own.

2. Chaplains should use the "floodlight" approach to the Bible rather than the "spotlight" and preach the brotherhood of man and social justice. The floodlight-spotlight analogy came to mind after a discussion of James Cone's liberation theology with a chaplain who asked, "What does the Bible say about liberation?"

The reply was, "What does the Bible say about anything else?" The spotlight was used on both sides of the dialogue. The floodlight would have helped my friend to see what Jesus said, "He hath sent me . . . to set at liberty them that are bruised" (Luke 4:18). The floodlight would have helped the respondent to see that Jesus also said, "The Kingdom of God is among you" (Luke 17:21). In short, I recommend that chaplains demythologize the "pure white" interpretation of the Bible and preach brotherhood and justice along with mercy and love.

3. The chaplain should learn to use liturgy in the military chapel which reflects his racial awareness. The pluralistic backgrounds of military parishioners demand no less. The leader of worship whose liturgy contains elements of racial awareness does not limit himself to the order of worship set forth in the *Armed Forces Hymnal.* (*The Book of Worship, Ventures in Worship 1, 2* and *3*,[12] contain many items of worship which are racially aware in content, and can be included in contemporary liturgy to help meet the variety of needs in a military community.)

[12] David Randolph, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973).

THE ARMY RACIAL AWARENESS PROGRAM AT ONE POST

Chaplain (MAJ) Carl S. King

Since President Harry S. Truman signed the desegregation proclamation on the 28th of July, 1948, the official policy of the United States military has been that of freedom from racial discrimination. However, only a handful would believe that just writing such a policy would solve the problem of racism in the military. In fact there have been a large number of policies, programs, and regulations promulgated by the various military structures to insure the fair treatment of all service personnel. The programs and policies have included the establishment of officer and enlisted military occupational specialties (MOS), establishment of race relations councils, establishment of race relations training in service schools, development of Affirmative Action Plans throughout the military, more ethnically related product availability in Post Exchanges and Commissaries, and additions to officer and enlisted efficiency reports to reflect racial interest. The intent of all of these policies has been to produce a massive change in one of the largest institutions in our society. It would be wishful thinking to believe that such change would come easy. To write a policy is easy, but to follow its implementation through the various levels of command is to discover the slashing contradiction between what ought to be and what is. To see that the policies against discrimination have been only partly successful is to see the reality, not the fantasy.

Over the years the thrust of race relations instruction has been to gain an insight into the whole person. During the early days it was believed that racism could be most effectively countered in a lecture type setting. The philosophy was that if a person were told of Black or Chicano or Asian-American contributions then he would become unprejudiced by acquiring knowledge. But this should be seen as the second stage of race training, not the first. The first stage was to do nothing. Basically, the military used the "ostrich" approach—do not look at it and maybe it will go away. However, events would not let this lie. The racial incidents in Europe, in Alabama, in Okinawa, in California, in North

---

Chaplain King is assigned to Headquarters, Fort Huachuca, Arizona with specific responsibilities in the Human Relations area. This article is based upon Chaplain King's experiences in race relations training at Fort Huachuca.

Carolina and in Georgia forced the sleeping giant to awaken. Between 1 October 1970 and 30 September 1971, there were 54 instances in which charges of racial discrimination were made. Statistics compiled by the Department of Defense raised questions as to minority participation in the military. In 1970, 13.5 percent of all enlisted men were black, while only 0.2 percent of the General Officer corps was black. The most telling statistic was that to the grade of Lieutenant Colonel the percentage of black officers remained fairly constant, approximately 2.2 percent. For Lieutenant Colonel and Colonels the percentage dropped to .6 percent. There has been, however, a little light at the end of the tunnel. By mid-1972 one black in the Army National Guard and one black in the Army Reserve had been promoted to General Officer status, and a concerted effort in recruiting officers from minority groups was producing changes in minority percentages of the officer corps.[1]

Down in the lower grades, racism has been even more obvious. In the performance of duties, majority and minority work side by side with little display of racial tension. This is not to claim that tension does not exist, because events prove otherwise. But in almost every recorded instance of racial tension in the Army, the tension exploded after duty hours or in off-duty situations, not during duty time. To blame all of the military tensions on racism would be naive. Many soldiers' complaints are based on other traditional areas of conflict, such as officer *vs* enlisted; NCO *vs* lower three; middle-class soldier *vs* working-class soldier; line *vs* staff; or combat *vs* non-combat units. The fact remains, however, that the general pattern of everyday relationships off the job is one of mutual racial separation. In short, the behavior of servicemen reflects the racial separatism of the larger American society.

For many white soldiers, military life is their first experience in living with those who are racially different. Most white soldiers, who by acculturation lean toward racial exclusion, tend to accept the racial integration of the military somewhat pragmatically. They see it as just another of the adjustments thrust upon them by the "green machine." According to the task force report on military justice published in the *Commander's Digest,* there is both intentional (individual) and systemic (institutional) discrimination in the military services.[2] The statistics summarized in that article deserve careful study by all military leaders. The members of the task force examined and discussed a large quantity of statistical data which led them to the conclusion that

[1] Loory, Stuart H., *Defeated* (New York: Random House, 1973) p. 5.
[2] *Commander's Digest,* March 22, 1973, p. 5.

there is a clearly discernible disparity in the implementation of military justice between minority and majority servicemen. In a study by the Motivation and Training Laboratory conducted recently at thirteen installations spreading from Europe to the United States to Asia, a perception of racial discrimination was uncovered in approximately three out of four blacks questioned, but in only one in ten whites was such perception noted.[3]

Racism is an emotional issue. To be called a racist is still, and *must* remain, a grievous insult. The instructor in race relations finds the situation complicated by this emotional "hidden agenda." If racism does exist in the Army, and the preponderance of evidence supports the claim that it does, then how can a program be devised which will alert the members of the military to the destructive potential of racism and racist behavior?

THE HUACHUCA PAST

To set the stage, let us look at the milieux in which Fort Huachuca exists. Fort Huachuca was founded in southeast Arizona in February, 1877. It was placed in its present location for the purpose of controlling the local Indian tribes and also to stop raiding Mexican outlaws who crossed the United States border in the mountains of the area. In 1913, with the arrival of the Black 10th Cavalry, whose members were called "Buffalo Soldiers," the post began its long history as the "black" post. The impact of this black history culminated when the colors of the Black 93rd Division were retired to the post on 28 April 1972. Fort Huachuca remained a "black" post until President Harry Truman signed his now famous desegregation order on 28 July 1948.

Fort Huachuca's contributions to the history of the United States Army have been honorable, long and predominantly black. At the present time, major activities at Fort Huachuca include the Headquarters for the United States Army Communications Command and the United States Army Intelligence Center and School. Obviously the history of this installation has had a uniquely racist flair. The task, therefore, is to form a program that will assist the command in dealing with the four minority groups represented in the military family of Fort Huachuca: the Black, the White, the Native American, and the Mexican-American. The program would also have to take into account the historical antecedents of the post.

In addition, the race relations facilitator has to realize that very little human behavior reflects a conscious motivation. To teach race relations, the instructor must necessarily seek insight into the subconscious or unconscious motivation of people. To

[3] *Race Relations Packet for Leaders*, Fort Benning: US Army Infantry School, p. 9.

solve the race relations problem in the military, the facilitator should realize that he cannot get to know the individual simply by listening to him or observing him. He can see what the individual does, but the *how* and the *why* are necessary to see the motivation of his behavior. To teach race relations is to expose the individual's value system to the group in the seminar, and that is extremely hard for most of us to do. The facilitator tries to cultivate and to encourage constructive behavior on the part of those whom he teaches.

The approach of the race relations instructor, therefore, is unabashedly behaviorist. He teaches race relations on the theory that, if you change a person's behavior, then his behavioral change will ultimately change his attitude. A person does not think himself into a new way of acting; he acts himself into a new way of thinking. According to Lippitt, Watson and Wesley, another job of the race relations facilitator is to increase the efficient use of group energy available in the seminar.[4] The facilitator must also teach the necessary skills to enable the seminar participants to have insight into the solutions of their own problems. His training must enable him to distinguish between the intellectual, emotional and behavioral parts of group interactions. Such training is essential to insure the use of proper skills in conducting such seminars. Without these skills the facilitator is like a ship without a rudder—he knows where he is going but he is not sure how he will get there.

THE HUACHUCA MODEL

The racial awareness program at Fort Huachuca is an effort to take into account both the historical antecedents and current dynamics of the best racial instruction techniques utilizing small group dynamics. The program here involves three basic thrusts. The first is the instructional program involving small group encounter; the second thrust comes through the inquiries made by the Human Affairs Division in response to racial complaints, real or imagined; the third thrust is that of the personal contacts of the facilitators interacting in the local military and civilian community.

The instructional program involves a twenty-hour block of instruction. These twenty hours are broken into five, four-hour segments. Each seminar is facilitated by a team composed of a majority and a minority representative. The general movement of the seminar is from the abstract towards the concrete. The first day is spent in increasing group communications and in dis-

[4] Lippitt, Ronald; Watson Jeanne; and Westley, Bruce, *The Dynamics of Planned Change* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958).

cussing racism as a concept. To increase communication skills each seminar operates with as few rules and guidelines as possible. However, it should be made clear that the seminar is for the purpose of the free interchange of ideas and feelings. To overcome the initial reticence and shyness, several games and simulations are used. The "Town Meeting" in which the minority seeks to argue for change while the majority argues for the status quo helps to get people talking. Another simulation involves using sets of children's toys (such as Tinker Toys) as a technique to open discussion. In this, the seminar is divided into smaller groups, and each is asked to build a model of what they feel the week of race relations instruction is all about. The models, which are surprisingly illustrative, give the facilitator a "lead-in" to the concept of racism. The concept of racism is approached through a working definition of racism. From the definition, the discussion is guided into individual and institutional racism. It should be remembered that at this stage only the concepts are taught. Both individual and institutional racism are returned to later on during the week.

On the second day, the discussion moves toward the introduction of cultural differences. Two of the most effective tools to introduce the concept of cultural difference are two games developed by a group in California called Simile II.[5] These two games or simulations are "Starpower" and "BáFá BáFá." Starpower is a simulation which develops a three-tiered society of "haves" and "have nots" and drives toward revolution. BáFá BáFá establishes two cultures based on two different value systems and different languages. Visitors from each culture travel to the other and try to interact with the people of the other culture. These simulations lead into a discussion of cultural divergence and of the problems involved in dealing with those who are "different." The concept of individual racism surfaces during the discussion following the simulation.

Ethnic and cultural studies are introduced on the third day. These are implemented by the utilization of films and resource personnel. The primary cultural groups discussed are Black, White Middle Class, Chicano, Native American and Asian-American cultures. The facilitators also prepare additional blocks of cultural instruction on the specific native American tribes located in the area of the post—the Appalachian, the Puertorriqueno, the Cubano—and life in the ghetto. These last groups are used to supplement regular instruction on the basis of the interest shown by the seminar.

On the fourth day, the problems of racism in the military are

[5] Simile II, P.O. Box 1023, La Jolla, CA 92037

introduced. This is done through a role play entitled "Fort Derri": a simulation developed by instructors at the Defense Race Relations Institute, Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. Through role play, a commander and his staff are confronted by an equal number of representatives of a militant group. The role players are instructed to play the stereo-type role rather than themselves in that position. This game makes it easy to introduce the concept of institutional racism and the particular problems of racism in the military. The fifth day is utilized to discuss the problems encountered at Fort Huachuca. Earlier in the week each person is encouraged to consider a question or a problem he has encountered at Fort Huachuca and to write that on a piece of paper for turn-in. The facilitators use these questions as a basis for the fifth day's discussion. As feedback for instructors to evaluate the seminar, a critique sheet is distributed to the class during the last hour. The participants are asked to be honest in their appraisal of the week's activities. These critique sheets are used by the instructor to evaluate the seminar in relationship to the goals he wanted to accomplish. From this feedback the instructional program is constantly being reviewed to insure the continued effectiveness of the seminar.

The other two thrusts of the Human Relations Office are secondary to the instructional goals. The inquiries made by the Human Relations Office are not investigations. They are simply efforts on the part of the members of the office to assist soldiers in ascertaining if their difficulties are racially motivated. If the inquiry indicates that further command involvement is required, the situation is channeled through appropriate investigative channels. The last thrust is through the involvement of the Human Relations staff in the community. No one can outline a system in which community involvement can be 100% effective. Each individual, however, will do what he feels will best assist the program's effectiveness. These three thrusts—education, inquiry, interaction—make up the heart of the racial awareness program at Fort Huachuca.

THE CHAPLAIN AND RACE RELATIONS

Although for the first hundred and seventy years of its existence the military was one of America's most segregated institutions, it has during the last twenty-five years leaped to the forefront of efforts seeking racial equality. The Army has not made this transition easily. In fact, if one believes that the problem has been *solved*, he is involved in an exercise of naiveté. The problem of racial discrimination in the military is far from solved. The soldiers we lead come from a society that is still racist. There is

another problem. Some in the race relations field are abysmally ignorant of what constitutes an effective race relations awareness program. Chaplains can assist their commanders by taking the lead in the use of small group instruction and group dynamics. The tapes released by the Human Resource Laboratories through the US Army Chaplain Board are excellent tools for use in such training. These tapes are titled "Encounter Tapes for Personal Growth," developed at Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, La Jolla, California.

In addition, as chaplains we must be willing to analyze our own behavioral patterns and attitudes to insure that what we *are* does not speak so loudly that those who listen cannot hear what we *say*. Chaplains, for all their counseling experience and training, find it exceedingly difficult to sit in judgment of their own racist behavior. We clergymen are generally unwilling to admit that there is an area of our life that is unexamined. But discussions with other race relations instructors seem to indicate a difficulty in teaching some chaplains that they have behavioral patterns that reveal to their listeners or counselees an underlying, unresolved problem in interpersonal relations. The use of "flag" words, of racist gestures, and of an *unexamined* frame of reference that assumes that all ethnic groups in our culture think alike, are problems for chaplains as well as for others.

This is not meant to be a blanket criticism of chaplains. However, it is a personal evaluation of instructors and of discussions held with chaplains. Chaplains, as persons charged with the responsibility of being a shepherd for God's flock, are discovering that they are not always seen as they think they are. Some chaplains are threatened by this discovery. Part of the problem is that his training, which gives the chaplain finite answers to infinite questions, conditioned him to see himself as a final authority—a *vox dei*. I must also add, however, that the current trend of chaplain-congregation confrontation in sermon critique is a very positive sign. It indicates a willingness to see ourselves as others see us. Now, if chaplains can show the same willingness to expose their personal value systems to critique by others, they may then discover that their assistance to their commanders in coping with racist unrest will be materially improved.

MUTUAL PROTECTION RELATIONSHIPS IN ANTICIPATORY GRIEF:

THE CONCEPT, ITS IMPLICATIONS, AND A REALISTIC PASTORAL APPROACH

Chaplain (LTC) Danny W. Burttram

INTRODUCTION

In recent years many articles dealing with the subject of death have appeared in various periodicals. Television programs have highlighted the subject on major networks. Students from a large New York City university undergraduate program have been given videotape equipment and sent out to interview persons in connection with accredited courses in thanatology. All this would indicate a growing interest in the area of this paper's concern. The interest is motivated by different factors in different persons—and the subject itself stimulates quite diverse reactions.

This paper represents one attempt among many to come to grips with the subject. The subject of death, however, is too broad and general for the scope of the paper. It seems far more pertinent to focus on the relationships which exist between the terminal patient and his (or her) significant others. The paper is further directed toward a specific type of relationship within the gamut of "happenings" between the one who is dying and his significant others. The terminology used to describe this specific type of relationship is "mutual protection relationships" which will be referred to as MPR.

I want to outline my assumptions and use them for our starting point. First, I assume that there is a process going on in the dying person and his significant others which has the goal of assisting these persons to come to grips with the anticipated death. This process is referred to as anticipatory grief. Many will go through specific phases [1] of anger, withdrawal, bargaining or denial. In all situations in which death is an anticipated outcome, there seems to be an operative process which is directed toward preparing the persons involved to deal with the harsh reality ahead.

[1] Elizabeth Kubler-Ross has given an elaborate and readable summary of these stages of grief in *On Death and Dying* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969).

Chaplain Burttram, formerly on the faculty of the United States Army Chaplain Center and School, is now enrolled in Supervisory CPE training at the New Haven Medical Center.

A second assumption is that anticipatory grief is not confined to dying persons and their most significant others. All persons who work with dying patients and their families find themselves involved in the same process. The degree of intensity of their involvement is directly related to the closeness of their relationship to the family with a member who is dying. This means that doctors, nurses, social workers and clergymen are all quite vulnerable to the same qualitative experience of anticipatory grief which is experienced by the dying patient and his family. Evidence of this can be seen in the relationships of the staff as the physical condition of certain patients (in whom the staff has deeply invested) deteriorates. The notes written on patient charts and among the staff often exhibit more anger, or more denial, or more detachment than at other times. All these are elements commonly present in grief. So when we speak of anticipatory grief, we are not just speaking of what happens to the patient and his family, but also, to an extent, to the professional staff.

A third assumption concerns the human reaction to stress. Based on my observation of work with hospitalized persons over the last three years, I assume that whenever a situation threatens a person, that person tends to take some kind of action to protect himself. The process is a natural one and it is based on the principle of self-protection. It can be seen in ordinary, everyday life situations, and it is particularly active in the terminal patient and his cluster of significant others. It is also an ever present tendency in professional personnel who work with terminal patients and their families.

I assume, fourth, that the most important learning in the area of understanding the needs of dying patients and their families takes place in the clinical situation. The word "clinical" does not necessarily imply presence in a hospital or treatment center. Rather it emphasizes the area of actual work with dying persons and their families. My own experience has underlined the validity of professional personnel learning from persons facing death—as opposed to the idea that professional personnel simply *teach* the dying person and his family how to face death. It seems to me that when the professional person can seek to facilitate and learn from the terminal patient's anticipatory grief, a climate is created which makes spiritual and emotional growth more a reality.

Fifth, I assume that persons can experience emotional and spiritual growth in time of crisis. This growth can be facilitated by professional personnel (nurses, doctors, chaplains and others) through an involvement which does not attempt to gloss over personal and interpersonal needs with a sugary veneer designed to keep deep feelings from surfacing. The type of involvement

needed does not come easily, because often when a person's deepest personal needs begin to surface, the situation seems threatening, and he longs for an escape mechanism, a "solve-all" to stop the uncovering process—to keep the other person's needs from threatening him. From such kindling rises the flame of a very tenuous mutual protection relationship—that is, when the spark of the situation is hot enough.

THE CONCEPT

Basic to the concept of MPR is an understanding of how it arises in the process of anticipatory grief. This is perhaps best illustrated by use of some of the dynamics of a chaplain attempting to minister to Annie, a 16 year old girl, and her family. Annie had been through a series of diagnostic tests which revealed that she had leukemia, and she was admitted to a large clinical treatment center which was research oriented. In his work with Annie and her family, the chaplain was able to identify certain happenings which caused him to be aware of the growth and spread of MPR in anticipatory grief. The awareness of this phenomenon developed slowly in stages of recognition.

The "Shh!" Factor

The first thing encountered by the chaplain might be described as the "Shh!" factor. Mrs. B., Annie's mother, did not want Annie to be left alone in the hospital, and she took definite steps to assure that the chaplain did not talk to Annie alone. She told her neighbor that Annie had "anemia." She spent much time comforting Annie and assuring her that everything would work out beautifully. She also attempted on several occasions to structure with doctors and chaplains that the word "leukemia" would not be mentioned around Annie. The "Shh!" was Mrs. B's chosen way of protecting her daughter from the truth which she felt would be too traumatic to deal with. At least this is the way she perceived it. Mrs. B. spoke to the hospital staff in a hushed voice—almost a whisper—and most of her chats with the doctors and chaplain were conducted in the corridor just outside Annie's room. The chaplain felt at the time that this "Shh!" factor style of relationship between terminal patient and parent (or significant other) was an exception to the general rule. He was to discover in later experience that it was the *rule* rather than the exception.

The Chaplain's Own Anxiety

The chaplain noticed, when he was finally able to talk with Annie, that he also was anxious. For some reason he wanted to make an approach to Annie and her mother which would not let them get upset, depressed. If Annie talked about or alluded to death or dying, the chaplain would feel a tendency to change the

subject or reassure her. The chaplain discovered that he could "keep Annie hopeful" through prayer or reading the Scripture. "After all," the chaplain surmised, "it's for *her* good." Only as he saw other hospital staff doing the same thing did he begin to question whether his action (and theirs) was motivated by a need to protect himself from Annie's anticipatory grief. Could it be that the same thing which was happening between Annie and Mrs. B. was also happening between Annie and the chaplain? This was a question which the chaplain had to face, and he was not always satisfied with his answers.

The Sensitivity of the Dying Person

The next step in the chaplain's dawning awareness of MPR came when he discovered the degree of sensitivity exhibited by Annie to those around her. She appeared to have a highly sensitive perception apparatus, and not only to what was said, but to what the chaplain really felt. She responded to the mood and feeling of the chaplain more than she responded to his words. It seemed uncanny to him that this 16 year old girl could sense what was going on in him. For instance, once after the chaplain had experienced a particularly traumatic day because of the sudden death of a patient to whom he had become attached, he stopped to talk with Annie—his last visit before the end of a trying day. The visit went something like this:

Chaplain: (trying to be cheerful) Hi, Annie. Thought I'd drop by to see how things are going with you. Got a few minutes to talk?

Annie: Sure. It's been kinda lonesome in here since Mom couldn't come today. And with all the commotion down the hall. . . . (A reference to the death of the patient whom she also knew.)

Chaplain: You're aware of what that was all about, I suppose.

Annie: Yes, K. was one of my best friends here. . . .

Chaplain: Want to talk about it?

Annie: (After a long pause) I know what let's do. I've got a new game up there on the shelf. Let's play the game.

For the next 20 minutes or so they played the game, which was an interesting one, and which directed their attention away from that which was threatening. The conversation never returned to K. A few days later, the chaplain visited Annie again and, in part, the conversation proceeded:

Chaplain: You know, last Tuesday when I was by here, I thought at first that we were going to talk about K. But we got off on that game. Wonder why?

Annie: Well, I did have something I wanted to talk to you about. But it just didn't seem like the right time for it.

Chaplain: Were you afraid you might cry if we talked about it?

Annie: No! Well, maybe. But I knew you must be tired and everything, and you'd been down there all day with K. and her mother, and . . . well. . . .

Chaplain: Hmm . . . sounds like you were afraid I might cry if we talked about it . . . I did feel washed out.

What the chaplain really felt was communicated to and perceived by Annie, no matter how hard he tried to cover up those feelings. The chaplain felt that this was an exception to the general rule. He was to discover that it was the general rule rather than the exception. If the chaplain tried to disguise his own feelings by appearing to be different from the way he really felt, he found that a terminal patient would do one of three things: withdraw from him emotionally by clamming up or giving verbal assent without involvement; try to protect (minister to?) the chaplain; or present surface problems not related to his own real needs. The patient would sense the chaplain's anxiety and attempt to avoid those things which he perceived would make the chaplain more anxious. He protected the chaplain, so to speak.

At the same time, the patient would be protecting himself. By not making the chaplain more anxious, he could assure that here was one person who would talk with him. To be sure, this approach by the patient took place within a subconscious area, just as do many of our interactions at the non-verbal level of communication. But there seemed to be some level of awareness in the patient to the real feelings of the chaplain. Many of the patient's responses could be better understood in light of this awareness. Could something of this same process be taking place between Annie and her significant others?

Spread of the "Shh!" Factor

The fourth step in the awareness of the chaplain of the MPR between Annie and her significant others came when he noticed how widespread the "Shh!" factor had become. Mrs. B., when talking with the chaplain, continually reminded him not to mention any of the items she discussed with him to Annie, or Annie's sister, Betty. Annie was very concerned that neither her mother nor her sister find out some of her real fears. She seemed very protective of them, as if her trauma would be too much for them to bear. Betty insisted that the chaplain mention none of these things to Annie or to her mother. The same thing seemed to be taking place between Annie and those who visited her. When talking with her peers, Annie always tried to be pleasant. Her peers spoke of the beautiful weather and how things were going to be when Annie got well.

Once Annie tried to tell her nurses about a dream which she had. In the dream her brains were being poured into two cups

on the bedside table, while she screamed and tried to resist, to no avail. She found her listeners very quick to reassure her, to change the subject. They pointed out to her that she should feel better when her hair grew back (during one phase of present treatment for leukemia, the patient's hair usually falls out), or reminded her that she was doing better than last week. This experience, and other similar ones, taught Annie that she should not be unpleasant, lest the persons she depended on begin to pull away from her emotionally, if not physically. She must protect them from her unpleasant feelings so that she could protect herself against the possibility that they would pull away from her. The "Shh!" factor was one tool Annie had for accomplishing this. A terminal patient doesn't have many tools at his disposal—that is, tools which produce some kind of meaningful result. He clings to and cherishes anything which seems to work.

Everyone Knew

The fifth and final realization which helped the chaplain see the relevance of MPR in situations involving the terminally ill was simply that, in spite of the "Shh" factor, anxiety, mutual protection and everything else, *everybody knew,* including the patient. In the case of Annie's family (which is not atypical), they were all aware of practically everything which was going on. But they all felt they must pretend that they didn't know.

The development of MPR seems to take place among the terminally ill and their families in a rather predictable manner. First, the patient learns that there is something "seriously" wrong with him. He does not have to be told in explicit medical terminology by a doctor or nurse. He simply notices that the doctor and family discuss his case quietly outside the door of his room. He notices that people act differently around him. Generally, other people appear to be nicer than usual, non-confrontive, pleasant, and rather subdued or quiet. Second, the patient then concludes that whatever is wrong with him, it is so bad that nobody wants to talk about it. "I'd better not bring up the subject," he surmises, "because it seems too tough for them to handle. If I share with them my own fears, they may get upset, or withdraw, and that may be more than *I* could handle." Third, the patient resolves to "keep his cool" as long as possible. This makes the family feel better, which is what he feels he should do for them. He spends his effort trying to conceal his real feelings so he will not alienate those around him. In this process the patient and his significant others are left to cope with their own anticipatory grief in isolation from each other as best they can, often choking on anger and despair which can be shared with no one. In such fashion,

many terminally ill patients ride the tide of their own internal anger and despair to their graves.

IMPLICATIONS

Once a person has become aware of MPR at work in actual situations he can understand its usefulness as well as its danger. Both sides of the issue need to be clearly identified by those who work with terminally ill persons and their families.

MPR Can Be Useful

Some form of MPR is quite useful to both the terminally ill patient and his significant others as a means of self protection against the overwhelming harshness of reality. This is particularly true in the earlier stages of anticipatory grief, and it can be equated with the stage of *denial.*[2] A non-structured group for parents of leukemic children was conducted weekly at a large treatment center, with two chaplains serving as co-leaders of the group. The co-leaders (one of whom is the author of this paper) found members of the group concerned with the question: "Has your child asked you yet?" There was much empathy as the parents shared their fears that "my child may ask me if he's going to die." Only toward the end of one child's terminal illness did her mother state, "I hope B. will ask me!" This mother, along with countless others, needed protection against the trauma of her child's approaching death—particularly in the earlier stages of terminal illness. Later as the disease progressed, the family situation brought on by the child's illness became more and more pressing. The mother was then able to move beyond her own need for denying the reality ahead. But that she needed this protective way of relating at first is undeniable. It served a useful purpose for both her and her daughter. Therefore, the person, professional or otherwise, who sees MPR as a type of evil to be confronted and batted down in every situation, completely misunderstands the problem. Rather, MPR is a useful tool for the terminally ill person and his significant others in dealing with the early stages of anticipatory grief. It is one of the very few tools available to them.

MPR Can Be Harmful or Nonproductive

At the same time we affirm the usefulness of MPR to the dying patient and his family, we must also affirm that there are certain dangers connected with it. Perhaps it would be better to state that, in many instances, MPR can become a barrier to a productive and meaningful expression of anticipatory grief. This style of relating can keep the patient and his family from moving

---

[2] See Kubler-Ross, *On Death and Dying*, Chapter Three.

beyond a stage of denial through other stages, such as anger and depression,[3] toward some degree of acceptance. Not every terminal patient will be capable of moving beyond the phase of denial. But few, if any, patients will move beyond denial if they continually encounter professional personnel who cannot function, at least at times, without their own mutual protection relationships. The most significant problem brought about by mutual protection relationships is that they can keep the family from meaningful sharing with each other in the various stages of grief. More often than not, a terminal patient is a step or two ahead of his significant others in the process of anticipatory grief. He is aware of much more than his family members are willing to talk about. Both patient and family seem to experience the same qualitative feelings related to the forthcoming tragedy, but at different times—the family later than the patient.

Shortly before his own untimely death, Dr. Carl A. Nighswonger wrote of the virtue of anticipatory grief which can be shared between patient and family. He called the process "grief synchronization."

> Grief synchronization reflects the ability of the family and the loved one to have coping patterns which allow them to share their feelings, frustrations, hopes, and concerns with each other as a part of the experience of walking through the valley of the shadow together.
>
> The human spirit has an amazing capacity to cope with loss when the individual is able to make some sense and meaning out of the experience. Families who are enabled to find meaning and purpose in the anticipated loss of a loved one constantly confirm my confidence in the integrity and beauty of the human spirit to cope with tragedy, hurt, and loss.
>
> The family's ability to find meaning within their shared experience can make the difference between fulfillment and frustration, acceptance and resignation. Effective grief synchronization implies the family and loved one's experiencing of congruence of meaning as they encounter death together.
>
> Realistic hope, which is essential to acceptance, implies that something purposeful and meaningful can come out of the experience which is being shared by the family and the loved one. It is unfortunate when families are denied the opportunity in search for meaning by vectors of professional or community interaction which inhibit or prevent such exploration.[4]

[3] It is not intended nor desired for the reader to equate the word "depression" as used here with the classic psychosis of that same name. Rather, the stage of depression in anticipatory grief represents an attempt by the patient to disengage from those relationships which he fears he will lose upon death. It usually takes the form of remorse, sadness, or isolation in the terminal patient, and is thus called depression.

[4] "The Vectors and Vital Signs in Grief Synchronization" is a position paper presented by Dr. Carl A. Nighswonger, D. Rel., Director of Chaplaincy Services, University of Chicago Hospitals and Clinics, and Director of the hospital's Program on Death and Dying—at the Foundation of Thanatology Symposium on Anticipatory Grief at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center, New York City, April 14, 1972.

All that is represented in Dr. Nighswonger's "grief synchronization" is seriously threatened by MPR. MPR may become the only way a patient and his significant others can deal with each other. Then sharing will be limited to those pleasantries of life which express little of the grief experienced by the persons involved. The process described by Dr. Nighswonger involves, at least to some extent, persons uncovering themselves to each other in such a way that they both experience spiritual and emotional growth. The process is not an easy one, because it involves sharing one's feelings about trauma. However, without such a process, anticipatory grief is easily cut short. It resides somewhere inside the dying patient and his significant others, seeking expression but finding little opportunity for it. The person in whom the unexpressed resides must feel strangely akin to T. S. Eliot's "Hollow Men":

Alas!

Our dried voices, when
We whisper together
Are quiet and meaningless
As rats' feet over broken glass
In our dry cellar
Shape without form, shade without colour,
Paralized force, gesture without motion;

This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper.[5]

Men and women with unexpressed grief may be seen by some professionals as making good patients. They do what they are told, usually without question. They don't disturb the other patients. They don't openly express anger, resentment or rebellion at their doctors. They don't ask embarrassing questions of nurses. They can be peaceful-looking, obedient, prayerful, reverent and quiet. They can be mildly pleasant, talking about anything which does not reveal their real feeling. It may seem strange that death would be more difficult for this person and his family than it is for others. But the person who works with terminally ill patients knows that, as strange as this seems, it contains an element of truth. One of the most crucial problems for the dying person lies in his relationships. If, in his relationships, he can move toward openness—an openness which allows him and his most significant others to share with each other the trauma of anticipatory grief—then he and his significant others move toward realistic hope. The movement together provides relief to both the patient and his

[5] *A Comprehensive Anthology of American Poetry*, Conrad Aiken, ed., p. 369.

significant others. But before the movement begins, there must be a way for them to break through some of the more binding fetters of the MPR.

A REALISTIC PASTORAL APPROACH

The third task of this paper is the most difficult because, at this point, the concept and the implications of MPR must touch down in such a way that a realistic pastoral approach can be discerned. Meaningful approaches will vary from pastor to pastor. They will also vary from situation to situation. Further guidelines and ideas are offered as a basis for discussion among pastors who wish to strengthen their ministry to terminally ill patients and their families through an effective understanding of MPR.

First, it is possible to completely ignore the forces of MPR at work in specific situations. But to do so may deprive a minister of an aspect of pastoral care which can make him more beneficial to those entrusted to his care. The dynamics connected with MPR are alive and real. They are no less real if they are ignored. They have a great deal to do with the interpersonal dynamics of the anticipatory grief situation. The very first step for the minister in recognizing and dealing with MPR is for him to discover how and when he himself is more inclined to use this type relationship. What is his initial reaction when a terminal patient says to him, tearfully: "Pastor, I'm gonna die and there ain't nothing anybody can do about it. It's unfair! I'm mad at God and everything He stands for in letting this happen to me!"? Is the pastor, in response, protective of the Church? Of himself as a minister? Does he try to calm the patient, get him to slack off in his expressed anger and depression? How the minister responds should provide clues to him concerning his own need for MPR and how these MPR work in him. Such understanding is basic for the pastor if he is to relate to the patient and his family in such a way as to facilitate them in overcoming their own MPR and moving toward "grief synchronization."

Second, it may help the pastor be more realistic in his ministry to the terminaly ill if he will ask himself three basic questions with reference to the MPR he sees in any given situation: (1) Does the MPR in this situation meet the real needs of all involved, or does it meet the needs of the family only? (2) Is the MPR in this situation presently needed or is it hindering a process of meaningful anticipatory grief for the patient and his family? (3) In this situation, how can I best facilitate all involved in experiencing God's love, right here, right now? The answers the pastor gives to these questions should assist him in determining the direction or thrust of his specific approach to the situation.

Third, it is often difficult for pastors and other professional staff to see themselves primarily as facilitators, but this is probably the most essential role for them to play in working with the MPR of the terminally ill person and his family. The pastor is often more comfortable reading something to the patient, doing something for the family, giving an answer or expounding a "spiritual truth." For him to be facilitative means that he seeks to minister in the situation by working toward enabling the dying person and his significant others to minister to each other. The pastor who feels that he must personally be the initiator of every deed of ministry to patient and family will have a difficult time assisting with a breakthrough in the MPR area. One of the crucial elements of the pastor's ministry to the terminally ill is a ministry to the other professional hospital staff. If he can assist the staff in becoming "facilitators" in addition to the other roles which are prescribed for them, he stands a better chance of meaningful ministry to the patient and family. Here again, if the pastor feels that he is the only channel of ministry, he has hamstrung and robbed himself of other channels of ministry.

Fourth, a realistic pastoral approach involves a pastor's willingness to move beyond the stage of denial into some areas which are emotionally charged and threatening. The pastor who cannot free himself from an overwhelming need to be reassuring will feel extremely uncomfortable when the terminal patient expresses depression or anger. Part of the anger may be expressed at the pastor who, after all, is God's agent—and didn't God (in the mind of the patient) cause this illness? This means that the pastor, sensitive to the needs of the patient and family for more sharing with each other, may find himself asking questions which are traumatic to deal with. This is different from the concept of ministry which pictures the pastor running around with a "soothing oil" to cover every possible harsh spot. At the same time, when the pastor is willing to move beyond denial, he must not resort to a crusading, iconoclastic attitude toward MPR in every situation. He must be able to accept the needs of the patient for any MPR which is meaningful to him, particularly in the early stages of the terminal illness. The movement beyond denial should not be initiated on the basis of the pastor's crusade for truth at all costs. Rather, the movement should result from the pastor's recognition of some degree of readiness in the patient or his family.

Fifth, the pastor who is realistic in his approach will be keenly aware of the uncanny ability of terminally ill patients to work through their MPR with each other. In large clinical institutions several persons on a given ward may be terminally ill; often

there is a sharing among these patients which moves much deeper and much faster than relationships with "outside" persons will allow. The same is true of parents from various backgrounds who find themselves clustered in a waiting room while their children are receiving treatment for leukemia (a scene not uncommon in many large treatment centers). The pastor is wise if he can realize the potential resources available in these already existing relationships among terminally ill patients or families of the terminally ill. Then, if he can make available to them a non-structured group experience (patients with other patients, family members with other family members) within a confidential climate, he will provide a means for them to support each other as they explore and cope with their greatest fears and traumas.

In the group setting, patients can often deal with their own anger and depression in a manner which they cannot with their families. Family members can interact with other family members to look at their own trauma with more openness than they feel they can exhibit to their terminally ill loved one. Through this sharing in patient or family groups, both patient and family are enabled to share more with each other. Thus, by emphasizing the importance of patient groups and family groups, the pastor is paving the road for more "grief synchronization." The process enables the participants to discount their own need for those MPR which keep patients and family from sharing with each other.

Sixth, a realistic pastoral approach involves dialogue between the pastor and the hospital staff. Increasingly, hospital staff are including pastors in their discussions and considerations. This is particularly true in the area of work with terminal patients. There seems to be a great deal of present interest in the question of whether a terminal patient (or his family) should be told when the condition is terminal. Although this is not the really crucial issue involved,[6] it may provide the pastor with an opportunity to think through with the staff what *is* meaningful for the terminal patient and his family. Perhaps the pastor will be able to see various forms of MPR lurking behind the question of "whether to tell," and through discussion with the staff, enable them to see their own part in either reinforcing the patient's need for denial, or moving beyond denial with the patient and his family to other

[6] The question "Shall we tell the patient?" appears to be a surface attempt to deal with some basic underlying fears in the professional staff, on the one hand, and the patient and his family, on the other. Usually, when the question is raised, the patient already has more awareness of his condition than the staff or family would like him to have. And the question itself is simply a manifestation of the staff's (or perhaps the family's) need for MPR. A far more pertinent question is: Are we willing to help the patient and his family work through the things they are already aware of? This question is somewht more threatening, but infinitely more meaningful in terms of the patients' needs.

aspects of anticipatory grief. The object of this type dialogue between pastor and hospital staff is not to give the pastor an opportunity to "lay something on" the staff. Rather it is seen as an opportunity for the pastor and the staff to assist each other in looking at their own styles of entering into relationships with the terminal patient and his family. The pastor can and should learn as much as he teaches.

A *seventh* facet of a realistic pastoral approach is connected with the recent interest in our society in planning for hospices for the dying. On the basis of positive reports from St. Christopher's Hospice in England, some attempts are being made to establish hospices for the dying in the United States. In our society, death has become institutionalized. As much as 85% of deaths in the United States occur in institutions such as hospitals. The dying patient is removed from the context of familiar relationships and placed in the antiseptic environment of the hospital. While in the hospital, he is cut off from those relationships which have been meaningful to him except for three or four visitor's hours each day. The hospital is geared to sustaining physical life, which is altogether noble and respectable. However, the dying patient has a need to tune in on a process which can perpare him for death, and hospitals are usually not geared for this. St. Christopher's Hospice offers some medical treatment, but the thrust of the organization is to assist the person in preparing for his own death in his own way. Certain rules normally found in hospitals are relaxed. Visiting hours are extended, and a dying patient and his family may live together in the Hospice under certain conditions. Hence, a favorable climate is created. Professional assistance is given to assist the dying patient and his family to move through the stages of anticipatory grief together. MPR can become a tool for support rather than a blockage from reality in such a climate. Pastoral involvement in the actual work of these hospices will afford new opportunities and expand traditional horizons of ministry to the terminally ill and their families.

Eighth and finally, a realistic pastoral approach is based on a clear conviction that a person's education for death is more meaningful if it is begun long before the person has a terminal illness. Our society's tendency to protect itself—and particularly its children—from all trauma (even those traumas which are "givens" in the human experience) has caused death to be considered a taboo, a scary topic to be hidden away behind a closet door. The door is opened only in the case of direst emergency, or perhaps by accident. Elderly persons are whisked away to hospitals and homes so that younger generations will not have to face the inevitability of aging and death. Funerals and other "morbid"

occasions are often not considered appropriate for children to attend. When things have been moving in this direction for generations, it is not difficult to understand why modern people find such solace in MPR which shield them from the dreaded and mysterious process of death.

Perhaps one of the best approaches for a pastor is to work gradually toward a meaningful integration of death and life in his ministry. The approach would involve encouragement of parents to allow children to participate in the grief process when Grandmother dies. The approach, further, would encourage parents and children to share their grief with each other, openly and unashamedly, and to talk with each other about its meaning for their lives. A pastoral thrust in this direction may mean that among the children of tomorrow, there will be less need for a prolonged use of those MPR which isolate persons from each other when they face the inevitability of death.

THE SALVATION TREE

John Killinger
New York: Harper and Row, 1973

When we look to "the rock from whence we were hewn" many of us might, like John Killinger, find that it resembles strangely a fountain square, an old-fashioned evangelist, and a simple message about man's need for God. Occasionally, some of us try to go back to those village fountain squares but they are not quite the same; they have changed, the world has changed, and so have we. Thomas Wolfe knew it all along—"You can't go home again."

What John Killinger so engagingly articulates for us in *The Salvation Tree,* is how we try to go home, to fill whatever "empty voids" we have, by seeking salvation through a multiplicity of other sources. And to some extent we find what we are looking for, but not completely. Professor Killinger writes in an autobiographical style of his own spiritual odyssey to some of the prominent salvations that are shaping our world today: education, technology, psychology, human engineering, and sociopolitical revolution. While each of these offers some help, and Professor Killinger is clearly indebted to most of them experientially, none is adequate to cure the whole man.

In *The Salvation Tree* these replacements are evaluated in relationship to the whole man. Killinger feels that faith is future oriented and the basic problem is finding a life style that is appropriate to our own time.

Ch (LTC) Wendell T. Wright

WE HAVE THIS MINISTRY

Leonard Griffith
Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1973

If as a chaplain your day begins, continues, and ends with a crisis, or if you're not quite as harried and have had time to contemplate your ministry and are wondering if your focus is clear, then this little book will be helpful.

The book doesn't say anything you haven't heard at one time or another about the profoundly relevant subject of ministry.

However, the author speaks of ministry in such a poignant fashion that when you put the book down you're glad you are in the ministry, and you want to get on with your work.

Dr. Griffith asserts that Jesus set the parameters, the strategy, and the responsibility of ministry. Jesus' ministry was not only in the basement of the chapel but in the sanctuary as well. Every encounter with man was followed by an encounter with God. Every period spent with God resulted in an involvement in the affairs and problems of men. And this confrontation with men was on an individual basis; it was a ministry to *persons* not people; it was a "suffering servant" ministry; it did not persuade the many but it enabled the few.

A valid ministry for the author is one which uses Jesus' ministry as the model. The role of the clergyman is to nurture the in-group of believers that they might reach out to the world and achieve a balance between the vertical and the horizontal relationship, namely, man to God and man to man.

Chaplain (LTC) Donald B. Beal

NOG'S VISION

Brian Hall
New York: Paulist Press, 1973, 142 pp.

What does a "child's" storybook offer a chaplain who is confronted daily with the harsher realities of the world? Nothing, you say? But, remember, Swift's social commentary, *Gulliver's Travels*, and Orwell's *Animal Farm* were also considered to be children's books in some literary corners; and more than a few ministers have read *Jonathan Livingstone Seagull. Nog's Vision* is written in a style not unlike these books.

Nog's Vision can be read by elementary school children and studied with profit in college (seminary?) English literature classes. It not only provides entertainment but stimulates and evokes thought as well. Brian Hall, through his fantasy characters called "Pricklies"—named thus for their porcupine-like quills—constructs a society in which *work* and *seriousness* are essential for a happy and satisfying life. The reader learns that the Pricklies found that being concerned with other Pricklies usually resulted in painful encounters, due to the prickles which covered their skin. Interpersonal relationships were discarded, therefore, in favor of less painful activity—namely, individual work. Chosen for a specific vocation at birth, the Pricklie fulfilled himself by working diligently.

Trickling through the porous language and fundamental simplicity of the book, one senses negative implications. For example, each Pricklie "knew his place" and "everybody did something." Almost mockingly, Hall condemns the system of values that emphasizes work for work's sake, and not for one's personal welfare and sense of creative well-being.

Upsetting this stable, secure, and dreary existence was Nog—a non-prickled Pricklie—who emerged as a person of vision. No one knew—not even the King of the Pricklies—what to do with Nog. He was somewhat like other Pricklies, but again was not like any other Pricklie: he had no prickles; he was a different color; his only talent was to dream and have visions; and he laughed. Nog gave a vision to each Pricklie, namely, that *everyone* was a king; everybody was somebody. Gradually, the Pricklies' prickles grew shorter and they learned to laugh. A sense of self-worth had been discovered. Although Nog mysteriously disappeared from the city, Nog's vision remained. The Pricklies began to celebrate, to hold festivals during which they did "all kinds of foolish and fun things," and came closer to each other than ever before.

Nog's Vision is a charming, tear and laughter-evoking, adult fairy story which turns all young people on—regardless of their age. If you need a vision, try a Pricklie.

Chaplain (LTC) Joseph E. Galle III

RESPONDING TO SUICIDAL CRISIS

Doman Lum
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 222 pp.

This short but intensive work on suicide grew out of pastoral concern and the experience of responding to personal crises in the lives of parishioners and others. Led to seek further training and study, the author worked at the Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center while simultaneously doing formal graduate study in the area of suicide and religion.

Responding to Suicidal Crisis provides a step-by-step assessment for the pastor. Beginning with a survey of the "problem," the author continues through theories of suicide to the development of ethical guidelines. The chapter on ethics is quite thorough, and alone worth the price of the book.

Lum's final chapters relate specifically how suicidal crisis can be handled in a program of pastoral care by the church. Not surprisingly, one of the models he suggests is the crisis hot-line which

chaplains helped pioneer through the HELP program. From reading this work, I'm convinced that the better managed HELP lines compare favorably with Lum's examples; this book certainly could provide background training for those installations still having crisis lines.

Though Lum's book is based on his academic dissertation, the language is not heavy but clearly readable. The work also contains an extensive and suggestive bibliography. This is the best short book on suicide I have read; it ought to be in the Chaplain's Library at every post.

Chaplain (LTC) Billy W. Libby

ATTACK ON PRIVACY

John Curtis Raines
Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1974, 144 pp.

There is a knock at the door one evening. You rise to answer the door, but before you can, a crew of cameramen enter. Without giving you an explanation, the crew sets up floodlights and cameras and begins filming your living room, kitchen, bedrooms and bath, disturbing your wife and children. A sound man busily throws switches and records the sounds of your home; a stenographer makes swift strokes on a pad of paper noting the quantity and quality of your furniture and appliances. Absurd? Perhaps, but John Curtis Raines in *Attack on Privacy* believes that our privacy already has been outrageously invaded in more subtle and devastating ways.

Attack on Privacy is both an attack on those prevalent attitudes which are de-privatizing Americans today, and a defense of the human qualities of personal dignity and respect. Raines demonstrates how our individual and group privacy is undergoing a sharply increased invasion.

His thesis is that what should remain private has been made public and what is public has become alarmingly private—resulting in the loss of self-esteem, privacy, and human dignity. The author predicts that we are heading toward the reversal of public and private worlds: persons turned public, politics becoming private. Raines asks:

> You ask for signs of the time? Wategate is one, with its undermining of the public political process for the benefit of established private advantages. The ubiquitous credit card is another, tracking the patterns of our personal and associational activities, rendering us machine readable and retained. The computer is a third, with its possibilities for networking diverse personal data systems: bank

records and credit ratings, educational and psychological testings, employment histories, political views, and protest activities.

What disturbs the author is "the degree to which the public acquiesces to and even welcomes this administrative invasion, this managerial takeover of our effectiveness as persons. We are *grateful* that others carry the burden of our lives!" (Italics added) Raines then moves into an area—the contemporary loss of meaningful selfhood—which carries the reader far beyond the all too familiar anti-establishment harangues. He views the loss of selfhood as a deep surrender of the spirit, as a panic before our exposure to numerous and probing "cameras," as a giving up on the lonely burden of transcendence. "Privacy is a matter of politics, but in the end it is a matter of the spirit," concludes the author.

His development of the rape of the spirit in chapter Five, "Privacy and Transcendence," is not only the highlight of the book but provides a significant spotlight which illumines our present spiritual predicament. "We are confronted," maintains Raines, "with a heightened awareness of our own finitude and our contingency in the rush of events." He contends that modern man has become "a kind of burned-over territory. Prior enthusiasms in their departure have left him stunned, lacking basic conviction, wandering and self-indulgent." This is a religious description which the author treats with candid concern. Courage is needed whereby one may affirm himself; one gets this courage through self-recognition: "That 'I am I' is my essential mystery, the certification of the right to be who I am. Such an awareness provides an absoluteness to the privacy of our inner space." Through a Tillichian perspective, Raines explains that because *we are*, we must therefore dare to be *our own story*—unique, never to be repeated. It is this sense of inner spiritual immensity in which privacy is rooted: "we do not belong to the state or to the marketplace . . . we belong finally to ourselves."

Attack on Privacy abounds in documentation. The author shows how—through rapidly expanding technological and administrative networks—individual Americans are losing their privacy. He provides examples from education, business, advertising, government, and the courts to illustrate just how *transparent* we have become.

In "Private Man and Public World," the concluding chapter, are practical ways of reversing the current trend. Raines advocates, among other methods, a system of privacy protection which includes legislation and controls over personal data systems. He also underscores heavily "the public's right to know." But all such legislative and administrative reforms made in the name of free-

dom, autonomy and dignity, depend upon the few "who stay alert and who are able when necessary to pay prices . . . when the trespass of liberty becomes sufficiently blatant and the times sufficiently critical."

The book reminds one of Vance Packard's works interestingly combined with Orwell's *1984*. It serves to remind us that people are America's most important resource; life is more than employment records, school grades, credit ratings, or tax files. The privacy of the people must be preserved. Although Americans have changed since the Bill of Rights was written, we have not yet lost our basic right to privacy. Then again, perhaps a knock at the door one evening—announcing someone's camera crew—will change our minds.

Chaplain (LTC) Joseph E. Galle III

TOMORROW: A NEW CHURCH

Bernard Besret
New York: Paulist Press, 1973

The Catholic Church in France is being buffeted by the same hurricane we are experiencing here in the States. Father Besret, a 35 year old Priest and former Prior of Bocquen Abbey in Brittany, invites us to join him in the hold of the ship. While the storm rages he shares with us his innermost thoughts . . . how we got ourselves into this storm and how we can get out again.

The book is ecumenical. Besret hates the present separatism. He talks to Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox, to all who are captivated by Jesus, who believe in Him and who are trying to live according to His Spirit. The timid and the security seekers should give this book a wide berth. "They will be better off with yesterday's catechisms; in these there are no problems, only answers." Yet Besret is not arrogant. Wondering to himself whether he's a heretic or prophet, he plunges on. "I write, then, but I tremble as I write."

He does not set out to rediscover the primitive church nor to conform to any past vision of the Church; rather he tries to explain the vitality of the Church, to discover forms in which a new Church can be meaningful and effective in today's world. He insists, however, that the new grow out of the old. Paradoxically he maintains that the deeper we steep ourselves in tradition the freer we become. We see further now, but only because we stand on the shoulders of past generations.

Having dipped the colors to the past. Besret clutches his bowl-

ing ball. He seems a bit sad; he seems a bit bored. (Between the pages one reads "Are we *still* quibbling about these?") The following tenpins fall in due order throughout the book . . .

1) denominational divisions
2) highly structured churches concerned more about their own organization than their mission
3) simplistic literalism of the Bible
4) frigidity in theology, morality and ritualism
5) baptizing of political or social programs
6) pyramid authoritarian church structures
7) celibacy and maleness as requisites for ministry
8) artificially and mechanically contrived liturgies
9) excommunications
10) arch conservatives ("they fire at anything that moves!")

This negativism is strictly low key. Besret is positive throughout. Those were listed because his vision is perceived through their opposites. Shunning the theological giants of the various deonominations who are crossing swords, the author joins the theological peasants who are crossing hearts.

He views Christianity today as a vast social club in the best sense of the word. This club is 20 centuries old, bears the scars of its long and turbulent history, and wears a thousand faces. Besret's new Church will rest on four legs: Faith, Remembrance, Prophecy, and Communion. By Faith he means not a blind adherence to a doctrine, but a conscious and free entering into Judeo-Christian history. This faith can never be proved in a laboratory; it can, in a sense, be proved by human lives. It is indeed proved to the author's satisfaction by the life of Jesus Christ.

The first Christians gathered together to help each other remember Jesus. The new Church will do just this. It will make the memory of Jesus come alive now; it will discover His meaning for today and perpetuate His Spirit and influence in today's world.

Besret's Church of tomorrow cannot be blueprinted in this review. One salient feature, however, merits special mention. He speaks of ministries and charisms. The three main functions of the Church require three categories of ministers.

1. *Ministers of the Word*

These are not necessarily the preachers, but those responsible for the proclamation of the good news. Preachers would be limited to those having a charism for it. (We are all painfully aware that ordination itself does *not* bestow this gift.)

2. *Ministers of Interpretation*

Those who have the special charism of discernment of spirits

(1 Cor 12:8–11) are so permeated by the Spirit of Jesus that they have a flair for separating the spurious from the genuine.

3. *Ministers of Unity*

Their task is to maintain communication in the Church. The local communions will, thus, dwell in harmony with each other and with the universal Church. This, of course, will require a certain plurality of view points and life styles.

I feel that Christians cannot have a great impact upon their world until they present one face to the world. When a Christian prays for unity he may mean "that all the other denominations see things *our* way." Besret tries to persuade all Christians to see things *Christ's* way. We may not agree with him entirely, but his approach seems, at least to me, what all Christians should be about today.

Chaplain (MAJ) Roger T. Dunn

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Name _____

New Address _____

_____

Old Address _____

_____

Send to: Military Chaplains' Review
US Army Chaplain Board
Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

FRED C. WEYAND
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

VERNE L. BOWERS
Major General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

Distribution:
Special

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1975—620-665/2

DA PAM 165-104—MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW, WINTER, 1975